

THE MANLY PRIEST

Clerical Celibacy, Masculinity, and Reform in
England and Normandy, 1066-1300

JENNIFER D. THIBODEAUX



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

The Manly Priest

THE MIDDLE AGES SERIES

Ruth Mazo Karras, Series Editor

Edward Peters, Founding Editor

A complete list of books in the series is available from the publisher.

The Manly Priest



Clerical Celibacy, Masculinity, and Reform
in England and Normandy, 1066–1300

Jennifer D. Thibodeaux

PENN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
Philadelphia

Copyright © 2015 University of Pennsylvania Press

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations used for purposes of review or scholarly citation, none of this book may be reproduced in any form by any means without written permission from the publisher.

Published by
University of Pennsylvania Press
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-4112
www.upenn.edu/pennpress

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
ISBN 978-0-8122-4752-7

For Owen Edward



This page intentionally left blank

Contents



Introduction

Gendered Bodies and Gendered Identities

1

Chapter 1

The Manly Celibate

15

Chapter 2

Legal Discourse and the Reality of Clerical Marriage

41

Chapter 3

The Marginality of Clerical Sons

64

Chapter 4

“The Natural Right of a Man”:

The Clerical Defense of Traditional Masculinity

86

Chapter 5

“They ought to be a model and example”:

The Expansion of Religious Manliness

112

Chapter 6

**Policing Priestly Bodies: The Conflict of Masculinities
Among the Norman Parish Clergy**

126

Conclusion

The Manly Priest

151

Notes

161

Bibliography

199

Index

221

Acknowledgments

229

Introduction



Gendered Bodies and Gendered Identities

In the late twelfth century, the Anglo-Norman archdeacon Gerald of Wales questioned the custom of clerical unions by describing the misfortune that priests suffered through their sexual relationships with women:

For they rob you of your money and property, and you spend on them what should be used to adorn the churches and help the poor. . . . They rob you also of your good name and honor throughout the country when, because of them, you cannot hold your head high before your superiors, your patrons, or even your parishioners (among whom all your authority becomes worthless). . . . To lose heaven because of this shameful part of the body and over a relationship which you possess neither by personal right nor as yours forever.¹

Gerald acknowledged in his *Jewel of the Church* that nowhere in the Bible or in apostolic tradition was marriage prohibited for the clergy. Yet celibacy was advocated for “the sake of greater purity and integrity.” Throughout this work, he consistently linked priests with sexual temptation, sexual disorder, and the misfortune that resulted from such illicit behavior.

For the medieval clergy of the reform era, there was a growing conflict between the concept of the celibate male body and that of the sexual one. Post-Conquest England and Normandy present a vibrant story of the intense competition between monks and clerics over a redefinition of the religious male body, a competition spurred by the prevailing custom of that region, clerical

marriage, and new efforts to impose clerical celibacy. This book examines the changing models of the religious male body from the late eleventh to the thirteenth century at a pivotal, transformative moment in the history of clerical masculinity, a period when celibacy laws were created and enforced. Celibacy decrees were motivated by a need to enforce sacramental purity and to prevent the alienation of church revenues, as others have argued; but the discourse of celibacy that reformers promoted throughout England and Normandy was inspired by a new gender paradigm for the priesthood. *The Manly Priest* looks at how this norm affected the religious male body, from monastic reformers who elevated the ascetic celibate to married clerics who defended their rights to marry; and also from the perspective of clerical sons, men who followed their cultural tradition and entered their fathers' occupations, to the lived experience of thirteenth-century parish priests, who, more than one hundred years after the beginning of the reform movement, continued to define their bodies by the local, cultural markers of manliness. This book highlights the complex intersection between celibacy and masculinity.

The monastic view of the male body was inherited from late antiquity, a time when some devout Christians lived lives of self-denial; monastic writers of the reform period likewise characterized the male body as one that required constant discipline and vigilance in order to transcend desires, not only sexual desire but all bodily appetites. But while the monastic body could not engage in sexual intercourse or masturbation, it was still a virile one through sexualized chastity, a set of performances that emphasized the fully intact body's struggle against sexual desires. Peter Brown has noted that, in the late Roman period, men and women used performances of gender to define their identities, as part of a complex negotiation he called "identity politics."² Similarly, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, religious writers, both monastic and clerical, used their notions of the body to create their gender identities and to highlight the deficiencies of others who did not conform to their models. Conflicts and defamation provide a means of expressing ideas of masculine identity. Priests, as secular clerics, operated in the world, living alongside laymen who defined manliness by their traditional cultural standards. As clerics resisted the manly celibate model, reformers continued to define and subject the priestly body to further standards of somatic control; by the thirteenth century, a priest's sexual and nonsexual actions had become the subject of ecclesiastical legislation, all toward the greater goal of a religious male embodiment.

Sacerdotal celibacy became a vital component of this religious male embod-

iment. In the late Roman era, Christian writers debated clerical celibacy and clerical marriage using scripture, commonly drawing a precedent back to the apostolic age. The Bible offers mixed and inconclusive messages on the issue of a celibate priesthood, providing no degree of certainty that Christ preferred celibate men over married men as his disciples; at times, the scriptures defend the marriage of ministers, but in other key passages encourage their sexual abstinence.³ In the promotion of a celibate priesthood, the Christian Church made ample use of these passages, particularly Paul's famous injunction in his letter to the Corinthians, which stated, "It is well for a man not to touch a woman," and "to the unmarried and widows I say that it is well for them to remain single as I do."⁴ The Hebrew model of priesthood was gradually adopted by the Christian Church during the fourth century, a model that required ritual abstinence because physical purity was necessary in order to offer sacrifices; however, the ritual abstinence required of Hebrew priests was temporary, and they were not barred from marriage or sexual intercourse, in general. Some vocal Christian advocates from the fourth century followed this custom, stressing the necessity for the physical purity of ministers but offered this practice as a permanent state: a life of chaste celibacy.⁵ Despite the contradictory evidence on clerical celibacy drawn from the Bible, it is clear that, in the late Roman era, Christians valued the ascetic life of self-denial, and much praise was bestowed on those who tamed their bodily desires.⁶

Leaving aside the dispute over its apostolic origins, celibacy as a mandate appeared in the early church councils of the fourth and fifth centuries.⁷ During this formative period of the Church, the idea that an active sexuality and ministry were conflicting values became widespread, despite the reality that deacons, priests, and bishops could marry and often did.⁸ The rise of Christian asceticism and the increasingly negative position regarding human sexuality undoubtedly contributed to the emphasis on clerical chastity but, more importantly, the adoption of the Hebrew model of the priesthood, along with the increasing emphasis on the priest's role in the Eucharist, prompted calls for clerical continence.⁹ After the third century, church officials increasingly adopted the position that ministers and their wives must abstain from sexual relations and live as siblings. This idea was further summarized in the fourth-century Council of Elvira (c. 305), which ordered that bishops, priests, and deacons must refrain from sex with their wives.¹⁰ Some historians view the Council of Elvira as the watershed moment of the clerical celibacy campaign because it was the first ecclesiastical council to mandate the sexual continence of the

married clergy;¹¹ this may be presumptuous since it was a regional council, with little ability to enforce its decrees across the region, much less throughout all of Europe. Elvira had some influence, however, as later councils utilized its ideas to continue to legislate for clerical continence. The Council of Nicea (325) rejected the harsh restrictions of Elvira and instead ordered that no priest could marry after ordination.¹² The Council of Carthage (390) decreed that those ministering at the altar must avoid sex to protect the purity of the sacrament; a second council at Carthage in 401 deprived priests of their offices if they did not obey the vow of chastity.¹³ By the fifth century, the connection between the sexual purity of the priestly body and the purity of the sacrament had already been made and would continue to be emphasized by Carolingian reformers in the ninth and tenth centuries.¹⁴

The pursuit of clerical celibacy by the reformist party in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was indeed part of a larger initiative to elevate and separate the clergy from the laity. The distinction between the laity and the clergy also was tied to issues of the priest's role in the Eucharist, which became even more significant when transubstantiation developed into a firm, doctrinal component of this sacrament with Lateran IV (1215). In post-Conquest England and Normandy, those who pushed clerical celibacy were generally seen as radicals, promoters of a new form of religious life for the priesthood. Essentially, they took a crucial core value of monastic life, chastity, and promoted it as a strict requirement for the secular clergy. This program of moral reform, based on chastity as well as celibacy, was unsuccessful among the majority of the elite clergy largely due to the nature of the Anglo-Norman Church during the reform period. During the tenures of Lanfranc and Anselm, only a third of bishops in England were monastic. The overwhelming majority were former royal clerics, rewarded with elite ecclesiastical positions by the king. Many had been educated in Norman cathedral chapters and held a position of some kind in the same chapter. The political leadership in this region was not averse to appointing monks to episcopal positions, but generally the king/duke favored his loyal civil servants for such appointments, men who were also proven administrators. The Normans who received these bishoprics traditionally then selected their own Norman colleagues for installation into the English Church, resulting in what one historian called the "normannization" of the elite clergy. In particular, Normans were selected for archdeaconries, positions that would only increase in power and prestige over the course of the reform era.¹⁵ Royal administrators became bishops in great numbers. By 1122, fifteen of the eighteen bishops in

England were former civil servants of the king, the highest since the Conquest; in Normandy, nearly all bishops between 1140 and 1230 were seculars who had some connection to royal/ducal authority or to powerful families in the region.¹⁶

The composition of the clergy, drawn from an elite group of civil servants, does not necessarily suggest political cohesion. As Everett Crosby more recently has affirmed, England and Normandy existed in a “fragmented and decentralized regime.”¹⁷ Such states, without mechanisms of strong social control, tend to tolerate more fluid performances of gender and sexuality. Bishops in this regime, drawn from lay society and indebted to royal/ducal authority as well as to family prerogatives, could disseminate reform initiatives or prevent their promulgation; while Roman decrees were read aloud at councils in England and Normandy, enforcement was subject to the whims of the particular bishop or archbishop in office. The Church in Normandy, for example, routinely selected only certain papal canons to disseminate, often neglecting those laws prohibiting lay investiture.¹⁸ Historically, Normandy had a high percentage of lay patronage over parish churches, quite possibly the highest of all of continental Europe.¹⁹ While some scholars have presupposed that monastic patrons selected more morally suitable clerics for parish churches and lay patrons presented ones with more disciplinary problems, there is little evidence to support such arguments.²⁰ To be sure, the extraordinary lay control of parish churches, combined with the Norman practice of ecclesiastical nepotism, did offer a difficult landscape to navigate for those who wished to enforce the celibacy of the secular clergy; but even monastic patrons sometimes presented clerics who would later be accused of sexual misconduct. The reform bishops, like Lanfranc, initiated measures to enforce chastity among the clergy; but oddly enough, it was Lanfranc’s push for more diocesan control, making reform the responsibility of the bishop, that ran counter to his goals. Secular bishops were often supporters of married clerics and their sons. They may have listened patiently while celibacy measures were promulgated, but they did little to enforce those laws. Hereditary transmission of benefices was quite common in England and Normandy, and reform legislation did little to disrupt this pattern, even well into the thirteenth century.

The Anglo-Norman Church was known for its unique “cross-Channel” clergy, men who were educated on one side of the English Channel and were appointed to positions on the other side. After the conquest of 1066, many Norman clerics were trained in English cathedrals, only to return eventually to Normandy. Others were educated in Norman chapters but assumed higher

appointments in England. The level of training for elite clerics refutes the idea that clerical resistance to mandated celibacy was due to the lack of education, as many have argued.²¹ This cross-Channel nature of the elite clergy allows the historian to track not only the various ecclesiastical appointments of one cleric but also to connect him to his father, brothers, and sons, along with other relatives, who also served the Church. The Anglo-Norman realm was not exceptional among medieval states in its tradition of married clergy and hereditary benefices, but the extensive prosopographies undertaken on this time period and region allow greater connections to be made than those possible for other regions of Europe.²²

Following Judith Bennett's lead that scholars should develop long-term historical narratives of gender, I have crossed traditional chronological boundaries in order to highlight the effect of the manly priest model on clergy over two centuries.²³ Thirteenth-century Normandy, part of France since 1204, provides a wealth of evidence for studying the effectiveness of reform legislation, particularly for the parish clergy. Most thirteenth-century Norman dioceses have not been studied in detail; however, the diocese of Rouen offers a unique set of documents for comparing the perspectives of those who opposed clerical celibacy and those who advocated it. Odo Rigaldus's visitation record amply shows that, as bishops and other elites conformed to the celibate model, the rural parish clergy continued to retain their unions with women, possibly passing benefices to their children while also blurring the boundaries between the laity and the clergy. The case study of the diocese of Rouen also shows another dynamic in play, as a series of reform measures were passed that broadened the regulation of the priestly body beyond celibacy. Following the lead from Lateran IV, the archbishops of Rouen began holding regular councils and synods, delivering papal mandates to the parish clergy, many of which included prohibitions on inappropriate dress, gambling, tavern frequenting, and other forms of errant behavior.

Historically, the secular clergy defined their gender identity differently because of the nature of their occupation, but they were not a homogeneous group. The analysis presented here highlights the social positions of clerics in major orders, those of priest, deacon, and subdeacon, along with those who held secular canonries, typically cathedral clerics. These men were the targets of clerical celibacy laws. While clerics in minor orders were allowed to marry, they were generally discouraged from doing so, particularly if they desired to ascend to Holy Orders. Men in monastic orders, to the contrary, followed ascetic prac-

tices, with celibacy at its core; in this way, they held themselves as distinct from the secular clergy. Many historians of gender do not consider these distinctions, or even the varied experiences of clerics in minor and major orders. If it is true that manliness is defined by a particular culture, time, and region, it must also be considered within the complexities of a growing and diverse medieval Church.

Ecclesiastical reform in the Middle Ages was eclectic, and my use of the terms “reform” and “reformers” is for the sake of stylistic simplicity and is not meant to describe a unified movement. Clerical celibacy laws, while uniformly directed at one goal, the separation (physical or sexual) of priests from their wives, actually reflect different motives on the part of any one group of reformers. In the fourth century, sexual continence was first mandated for clerics out of the desire for cultic purity. While cultic purity was also the motive behind the Carolingian reform of clerical sexuality, by the time of the Councils of Pavia (1022) and Bourges (1031), economic concerns prompted a renewed effort at clerical chastity, as local reformers feared the despoliation of churches. While the secondary literature on clerical celibacy is rich, there is no scholarly consensus on how large a role celibacy played in the minds of ecclesiastical reformers. Gerd Tellenbach asserted that clerical celibacy was not at the heart of the papal reform movement;²⁴ and there is some dispute over whether cultic purity or moral suitability was the key motive behind Pope Gregory VII’s legislation on the matter.²⁵ No matter the goals and motives of papal reform during the mid-eleventh century, the discourse from England and Normandy after 1066 was more concerned with the effects of impurity on the priestly body and the masculinization of that body. Clerical celibacy became part of a larger agenda, as I show by including the pastoral revolution of the thirteenth century, a movement spurred by the canons of Lateran IV. The celibate ideal was built over the course of centuries, by reformers who installed an ascetic model of manliness as the dominant paradigm for the clergy. The discourse promoted from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries emphasized a different form of manliness, one that not only defined a code of sexual purity for the secular clergy but one that would also eventually encompass their bodily appearance and comportment.

The body, then, becomes a new model for historicizing clerical celibacy and, more broadly, clerical reform. The anthropologist Mary Douglas theorized that the body is a reflection of society and that societies use “different degrees of disembodiment to express the social hierarchy.” Within these social structures, there are varying means in which “the social system seeks progressively to disembody or etherealize the forms of expression.”²⁶ Bodies that leak, that produce

substances, are believed by many societies to cause pollution; in the Middle Ages, many religious men equated leaking bodies with feminized bodies. Thus, bodies that produced nocturnal emissions, menstruated, ejaculated, or bled after childbirth were seen as contaminating and feminine. Dyan Elliott, Conrad Leyser, and Jacqueline Murray have all studied how religious men wrote about pollution by involuntary ejaculations and how they addressed solutions to this “problem of male embodiment.”²⁷ Drawing on diverse works on the body in history, Lynda Coon has examined the Carolingian monastic body as a “sign of the rift between civilized and barbaric” and theorized a “massive continuity” between classical definitions of gender and those of the early Middle Ages. The “bounded body” of the monk became a symbol of the cloister, both impenetrable and controlled, while the bodies of laymen were viewed as closer to feminine, due to their “bodily fluxes and the all-consuming libido.”²⁸

Douglas’s formulations have been further applied by scholars like Peter Brown and others who have focused on the body and its relation to society, primarily with how groups that are threatened by external forces express anxiety about bodily purity. England and Normandy between 1066 and 1300 provide an excellent case study of how monastic anxiety about ritual purity created a drive to claim the priestly body and assimilate it to a greater masculinity. Monastic discourse focused on depicting the monastic body as superior to the priestly, and its superiority was expressed by its greater degree of manliness. In this regard, priests had to assimilate to this model of manliness, not only to ensure the purity of the sacraments but also to embody a religious masculinity. This discourse appeared at a time when elite laymen entered Church service, and when there were few monastic bishops in England and Normandy. Nonetheless, monastic reformers pushed laws mandating clerical celibacy, focusing on the bodily impurity and effeminacy of priests. Clerical defenders of marriage pushed back, emphasizing the integrity of their priestly bodies within marriage. The pastoral revolution of the thirteenth century brought councils and synods along with reforming archbishops who were concerned not only with sexual continence among the clergy, but also with their bodily comportment, gesture, and appearance. Lateran IV had given reformers an administrative system to enforce their standards of priestly masculinity; armed with these legal procedures, reform bishops sought to eradicate among the clergy the practices of gambling (which corrupted the body through the love of wealth), tavern frequenting and excessive drinking (which threatened somatic control on many levels), scurri-

lous speech (which violated the boundaries of vocal control), and violent behavior (which brought pollution on the most basic level by bloodshed).

How might the adoption of a chaste body affect the masculine identity of religious men, especially priests, in the Middle Ages? The answers depend on whom you ask. Work on medieval masculinity and religious men has produced numerous answers to this question, and the only reasonable conclusion is that time period, region, and even ecclesiastical rank matter.²⁹ To be sure, locating sexuality as a central component of medieval manliness poses difficulties for defining the clerical, celibate body, particularly if one accepts Vern Bullough's assertion that masculinity is dependent on "impregnating women, protecting dependents, and serving as provider to one's family."³⁰ Indeed, a medieval man who failed to perform these three criteria might have his manliness questioned, but not if he was able to demonstrate the struggle and resulting conquest over his own body. R. N. Swanson proposed that celibate clergy constitute a category between male and female, an "emasculinity" or third gender; others have followed suit.³¹ Yet medieval people recognized a gender system of binaries, male and female; and while there were manly women who transcended their bodies to become spiritually male and womanly men who failed to transcend their bodies and were viewed as softened, there is no evidence to suggest that a third gender existed.³²

Recent work on clerical masculinity, clerical marriage, and clerical concubinage has all produced different answers to the question of manliness and embodiment. In contrast to Swanson's assertions about "emasculinity," scholars such as Patricia Cullum, Derek Neal, and Janelle Werner have presented studies of the clergy, sexuality, and celibacy based on the assertion that clerics saw themselves as masculine. Cullum has suggested that in late medieval England factors such as acquisition of a benefice and clerical rank were large determinants in clerical gender identity. Benefices provided clerics with householder status, and often minor clerics lived under the same roof with senior clergymen, who might act as surrogate fathers. For others, acquisition of a clerical, celibate identity was more fragile and resulted in lay-like masculine behavior.³³ Derek Neal countered these conclusions in his examination of late medieval England, suggesting that lay masculinity and clerical masculinity were essentially the same, and that priests who broke their vows of chastity effectively became "false thieves." By the late fourteenth century, "failure to maintain a clerical ideal could diminish one's masculine social self in the lay world."³⁴ Janelle Werner's research

on concubinous priests probes the rural context of the late medieval diocese of Hereford. Werner concludes that, given the sizeable proportion of unchaste priests, historians should consider “a more flexible definition of clerical masculinity” since the existence of such men “might help elucidate what was quintessentially masculine in late medieval society.”³⁵ What all these studies have in common is that they are focused on the later Middle Ages, when celibacy was the rule and had been for over two hundred years. Any clerical unions that did exist had no claims to legitimacy, and the cleric and his parish community were well aware of this fact.³⁶ My book examines gender identity, particularly masculine identity, from moments of conflict in the reform period, when two sides battled over the institution of clerical celibacy, the eradication of clerical marriage, and eventually, control over the entire priestly body.

Gender identity is not always obvious, especially in the Middle Ages. The actors under scrutiny do not always proclaim explicitly what they believed to be the proper role and function of a man in their time, and the vast majority of writers during this period were men in religious orders. Thus, historians, especially historians of gender, must look at the ways that masculinity was understood and expressed implicitly. The conflicts and struggles over celibacy and the reform of the clergy provide these very opportunities to examine the discourse of sexuality and the male body, particularly at the beginning of the reform period. Since masculinity is always tied to a struggle of some kind (manliness is proven by a defense and reinforcement of that particular masculinity), the religious tracts and laws mandating celibacy offer insights into how celibate men defended their manliness. I point to some common ideas presented by diverse voices who sought to change or simply chronicle the events and people of the Anglo-Norman Church. Orderic Vitalis and William of Malmesbury were not church reformers, but they absorbed and presented the ideas of that initiative in their chronicles and religious histories. Not all monastic reformers believed that chastity should be a requirement for the secular clergy; some, like the Cistercian John of Forde, were little bothered by married priests and their sons and believed in their moral suitability for the ministry.³⁷ Yet the monastic voices that survive from this period overwhelmingly urge clerical continence, and they do so in a particularly gendered fashion. Similarly, the treatises authored by advocates of clerical marriage illustrate their own conceptions of male identity. Women were subjects in the conversation on clerical marriage and clerical celibacy, but they had marginal roles, their voices obscured through misogynist discourse.³⁸

The Manly Priest offers a revisionist approach to the study of clerical celibacy, by illustrating the complex system of gender ideology that affected the creation, negotiation, and acceptance of the celibate ideal. Medieval scholars have written many books and articles on the subject of clerical celibacy, and they have largely concluded that increasing concerns over sacramental purity and the economic alienation of parish wealth and property led the Church to mandate a celibate priesthood. This is precisely the direction of the edited volume *Medieval Purity and Piety*, by Michael Frassetto, and the monograph *Married Priests and the Reforming Papacy*, by Anne Barstow.³⁹ Sacramental purity and the economic alienation of ecclesiastical property were certainly factors in the drive for celibacy; what has been overlooked is how the discourse of this debate was gendered as part of a specific, masculine model. When contextualized, celibacy laws become a part of a larger initiative to reconceive the religious male body and, in doing so, elevate and separate the priesthood from the laity. Celibacy was only the first objective in the re-creation of a manly priesthood, however; reformers of the thirteenth century would continue this work by passing laws to control and regulate a full spectrum of behavior. What follows is not a case for Norman exceptionality in terms of manliness or clerical marriage; instead, this region provides rich and exciting evidence that offers, at times, a first-hand account of how the conflict over clerical celibacy laws played out.

In Chapter 1, I show how religious writers ascribed manliness to ascetic bodies, elevating the struggle against the flesh as the pivotal one in defining gender identity. By masculinizing monastic bodies, writers created an anti-norm of clerical behavior, one that rendered priestly bodies and elite bodies unmanly, through appearance, actions, and especially sexual behavior. Sexualized chastity emerged as the reform model for priestly bodies, a model that rendered chaste bodies virile as they fought sexual desire. This model was not an innovative creation of Anglo-Norman bishops and reformers, but it was disseminated in their hagiography, chronicles, histories, letters, theological tracts, laws, and conciliar decrees.

Social control plays out through the control of the body. Revised ideas on gender and masculinity can only become effective if deployed through a legal system. Chapter 2 depicts the social context of clerical marriage and underscores the legal maneuvers of those who sought to impose the manly celibate ideal on the priesthood. Both in England and Normandy, lay manliness was strongly connected to marriage and kinship, and the inability to procreate removed one from the primacy of the social network built on these values. Mar-

riage was so entrenched among the elite clergy that even bishops had wives and cathedral canons placed their sons into prominent positions. Secular clerics drew their gender identity from lay society, participating in the same cultural framework that connected manliness to sexual prowess. Celibacy legislation directed at the clergy may not have been wholly successful in enforcing chastity, but it did begin to shape a new social understanding of clerical marriage, as these marriages were eventually legally invalidated.

Clerical sons were the most glaring reminders of their father's virile bodies. In Chapter 3, I show how the manly celibate ideology had implications for clerical children, especially sons who intended to inherit their fathers' benefices. Clerical sons first had liminal and then marginal bodies; while they were once assured of a career path, the passage of reform legislation ensured that they faced an existence in between cultural acceptance and legal bastardization. Certain communities in England and Normandy supported the training and education of clerical sons, and many clerical fathers passed their occupations to their sons, just as the sons of the laity did. Clerical sons faced an uncertain future and a marginal status, not through any actions of their own but because they were visible signs of priestly sexuality. Laws against ordination of clerical sons and inheritance of benefices reflected not only the desire of reformers to prevent this system but also to eliminate procreation completely as a model of manliness for the secular clergy. The legal state of clerical sons became more precarious as clerical marriage, in law and practice, was gradually extinguished.

While Chapters 2 and 3 describe the reformers' perspective behind the manly celibate ideology, Chapter 4 presents the view of this concept from married priests, their sons, and their advocates and shows how this response was based on a model of lay manliness. A large number of pro-clerical marriage treatises appeared in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Clerical writers, presumably married ones, confronted ascetic discourse by using the scriptures and medieval theology to defend the righteousness of marriage, the very sources used by advocates of celibacy. These tracts illustrate how married clerics perceived the chaste bodies of their opponents. Clerical marriage, they argued, was a natural right, and mastery of the male body depended on marital sex. Their arguments rested on the presumed vulnerability of the male body, along with the concept of a heteronormative sexuality. Married clerics perceived celibacy decrees as a new tradition, one directed at them by sodomites (monastic reformers) and one which went against the laws of God. The tracts defending

the ordination of clerical sons used similar rhetoric as the tracts for clerical marriage.

Chapter 5 shows the expansion of the manly celibate ideology by examining the thirteenth-century province of Normandy after its separation from England. The pastoral revolution of the thirteenth century brought an expanded model of religious manliness to Normandy, disseminated through councils and synods and enforced by a series of reforming archbishops. Once closed off to papal reform initiatives, Normandy opened the door to these reform canons as they originated in Lateran IV and were reissued throughout the province. Bishops now had more legal control over priestly behavior and also more means of effective enforcement. They expanded their reach to control not only clerical sexuality but also priestly conduct and appearance. The apex of reform was reached with the episcopacy of archbishop Odo Rigaldus of Rouen, whose sermons preached the very ideals embodied in pastoral reform.

Chapter 6 illustrates the state of the priestly body in the thirteenth century, when reform was extended beyond the chaste body, to a new clerical manliness built on appearance, behavior, and comportment. By the mid-thirteenth century, reform was successful for the elite clergy in Normandy; they were largely celibate, and they embraced, for the most part, the ideology of the manly celibate. This chapter shows the contrast between the "monasticized" elite and the rank-and-file parish clergy by focusing on the reform efforts of Odo Rigaldus. Thirteenth-century Norman priests exhibited inappropriate behavior beyond sexual activity and clerical marriage; they gambled, frequented taverns, engaged in violent behavior, and wore inappropriate secular clothing, all aspects of lay manliness in rural Normandy. Parish clerics were caught between the social status of a cleric and acceptance into a community of their peers. New legal maneuvers were used to eradicate scandal but also to serve as a mechanism to control priestly behavior and appearance.

During the period of ecclesiastical reform in England and Normandy, the real struggle of masculinity occurred not between the clergy and laity but between monastic reformers and the secular clergy. Celibacy was the crucial issue of this period, but it was not the only conflict that would emerge between these groups. Monastics and seculars would compete in a gendered arena, one in which women did not have an explicit role. As the seeds of reform sprouted, the radical changes in religious life clashed with traditional clerical culture. As these reforming ideals took root, the upper clergy began the transformation

from householder to celibate elite. By the middle of the thirteenth century, when virtually all the bishops of England and Normandy were chaste and lived and supported the ideal of the manly celibate, the lower clergy were still unreformed. The extension of the manly priest model to include behavior and appearance made it even more difficult for the parish clergy to embrace their religious status as priests, to function in a social sphere that isolated them from the very deeds that equated manliness to them.

Chapter 1



The Manly Celibate

The priest Odelerius advised the Norman aristocrat Earl Roger to endow a Benedictine monastery; he persuaded him by portraying Benedictine monks in the following manner:

Consider now what duties are performed in monasteries obedient to a rule by those trained in the service of God. Countless benefits are obtained there every day, and Christ's garrisons struggle manfully (*viriliter*) against the devil. Assuredly the harder the struggle of the spiritual warrior the more glorious will be his victory, and the more precious trophies in the courts of Heaven. . . . when I consider the rites of men in different parts of the world, and carefully look into the lives of hermits and canons, I see that all are inferior in their way of life to monks who live canonical lives under a rule. . . . I admonish you to found a monastery while you may in your county. . . . as a citadel of God against Satan, where the cowed champions may engage in ceaseless combat against Behemoth for your soul. . . . Rise up at once; begin *manfully* (*viriliter*), perform God's work nobly.¹

Odelerius was the father of the Anglo-Norman chronicler Orderic Vitalis, a priest himself who also took monastic vows. This passage portrays the glorification of monastic life that took place during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the period of reform in England and Normandy. Narratives like this defined the manly celibate model of masculinity. This gendered model, which reemerged

during the reform era, originated in the Western practice of monasticism; by using the language of virility and ascetic ideology, religious writers elevated monastic manliness to a hegemonic level. Religious manliness, as I will call it, was distinguished from secular conceptions of masculinity by its focus on the superior celibate body.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore how this discourse appeared in Anglo-Norman reform-era texts and how these ideas ultimately affected the transitioning standards for priests and other secular clerics. Texts produced during this time underscore that reform was the establishment of a correct religious masculinity, one built on the ethos of self-restraint and *virtus* and one focused on chastity as a centrally defining feature. The religious male body was masculinized through discipline, integrity, and impenetrability.² These presuppositions about religious manliness circulated in these texts, some to mixed audiences of lay, clerical, and monastic readers.³

The religious texts examined here discursively re-created the religious male body—a new man, one with self-control, who embraced orderliness and who was fit to rule. The manly celibate model was expressed through chronicles, *vitae*, histories, and theological treatises; legal discourse, discussed in the next chapter, placed this model behind the force of law.

The Celibate Male and the Language of Virility

Masculinity is defined in large part by language, and the language produced by Anglo-Norman religious writers shows that a certain masculine performance was expected of both laity and clergy, albeit very different performances. Religious writers particularly created a standard of masculinity through their use of virile language to describe the actions and behavior of celibate men in a variety of situations; most notably, the use of this language in papal correspondence greatly increased during the reform era. As this chapter will show, such language also increased in the reform-era texts of England and Normandy.⁴

In the late Roman Empire, such masculine language had been used by Christian writers to assert the manliness of their men at a time when pagan Romans defined manhood.⁵ Anglo-Norman writers of the reform era used the same terminology of manliness, often drawing on this late antique vocabulary of words and images to evoke an association of manliness with ascetic practices. The gendered language used by religious writers to portray masculinity did not distinguish between secular and religious men. The vocabulary was the same,

interchangeable language that could describe manliness on the battleground or inside the cloister. Writers relied on a terminology of oppositions to describe manliness and the lack of manliness. Physical and mental manliness appeared in contrast to physical and mental femininity. The most common terms to express masculine qualities and actions were *duritia* (hardness), *robur* (hardness), *virtus* (masculine virtue), *viriliter* (manfully), *virile* (manly), and *fortiter* (manfully). The terms used to portray a lack of manliness were mostly terms used to describe women but also could be terms that referred to unmanly behavior. Words like *mollitia* (softness/effeminacy), *semivir* (half-man), *catamite* (sodomite), *effeminatus* (effeminate), *delicatus* (effeminate), *muliebriarius* (womanly), and *eviratus* (unmanned), all evoked images of the disorderly, the softened, the penetrable, and the weak (physically and mentally), undesirable characteristics for any man, religious or secular.⁶

Although armed with a rich terminology to describe virility, religious writers preferred to denote masculinity most commonly with the Latin derivatives of *vir* (man). Most recently, historians Kirsten Fenton and Maureen Miller have shown the gendered meanings of the term *virtus*, emphasizing its connotation with the military manliness of laymen as often as the spiritual manliness of religious men.⁷ Others have documented the “language of virility” in reform-era writing, particularly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when terms like the adverb *viriliter* were frequently used to describe clerical action.⁸ In the context of war, *virtus* clearly translated into masculine power and strength. For instance, in Orderic Vitalis’s *Ecclesiastical History*, one finds numerous cases of manly language appearing in descriptions of war, knights, and battle generally. Scholars have not hesitated to translate these terms into masculine language.⁹ But for religious figures, historians have traditionally translated the term *virtu* as “virtue” in the spiritual or religious sense. By insisting on translating terms such as *viriliter* as “courageously” or “strongly,” scholars have essentially removed the original gendered language of the document, and at the same time have transposed their own gendered assumptions from the present onto the past. The use of terms like *viriliter* (manfully) in these writings is what reflects the gendered quality of this discourse.

Religious writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries used a variety of literary techniques in their works to show the superiority of religious masculinity to secular masculinity, and ultimately clerical masculinity, particularly through the contrast of the self-controlled body with the disorderly, uncontrolled one. Maureen Miller has shown that Gregorian-era writers depicted laymen as

destroyers of churches and monasteries, as bloodthirsty warriors, as men out of control, while the clergy were depicted as morally superior, self-controlled men.¹⁰ Likewise, the same motifs were used by reform-minded religious writers of England and Normandy, but more often to highlight the orderly, self-controlled ascetic life of monks against the disorderly, sexually licentious behavior of secular clergy. Virile language emphasized this distinction.

The use of such virile language to describe religious men might seem confusing and contradictory to the use of gendered language by some monastic orders. During the period of reform, the literature of the Cistercian order occasionally utilized maternal imagery to express a spiritual relationship to God and Christ.¹¹ Although Cistercians most frequently deployed this imagery, it was not uniquely theirs alone, and even reformers like Anselm used it. Various scholars have used this imagery to bolster their position that the clergy viewed themselves as feminine and were, in turn, viewed as feminine by medieval society.¹² However, the feminine language used by these monastic writers was very specific to their particular, Cistercian context; this language was strongly connected to Cistercians abbots' own anxieties regarding their leadership and their pastoral duties.¹³ Furthermore, these maternal metaphors in their proper historical context were used as literary devices in Cistercian devotional literature. Bernard of Clairvaux, a writer who most frequently made use of maternal imagery, called his monks "women" not to suggest that he or his society viewed them as women but to present a gendered inversion that highlighted the humility present in the feminine.¹⁴ Finally, monastic writers, themselves clearly male, had a metaphorical problem when it came to describing their (often sexual) union with a frequently masculinized God. This logically explains the frequency with which monks portrayed themselves as female, as a bride of Christ, in order to wed God/Christ. Alternatively, they could portray God as female, and then their union was possible.¹⁵

The abbot as "mother" and the feminized monk were literary devices firmly a part of a particular devotional literature of the twelfth century. But in both "public" and private writings, reform-era authors equated manly behavior and manly qualities with celibate men; they were not depicted as feminine or as an ambiguous "third" gender. For example, while there is evidence that Anselm of Bec/Canterbury employed feminized language and maternal imagery in one devotional prayer,¹⁶ he used virile language most often when he wrote to other clerics advising them. In his letter to William, a monk of St. Werburgh, Chester, he advises him to continue to seek spiritual perfection as all men must

strive: "Let laymen in their state of life, clerics in theirs, monks in theirs manfully (*viriliter*) apply themselves to making continual progress."¹⁷ He wrote to the bishops of Ireland that they should "act manfully (*viriliter*) and vigilantly according to God's teaching, restraining with canonical severity anything found in your provinces contrary to the doctrine of the Church."¹⁸

The use of masculine language to describe a variety of ascetic actions and behavior reinforces that monastic writers conceived of the ascetic body as a virile body. Most frequently, this language depicted conflicts, both internal ones of the body and external struggles with others (both laymen and ecclesiastics). To be a man of the church required a constant struggle, a constant gender performance of *virtus*; this struggle could be spiritual or earthly. A letter from Benedict (whose full identity remains unknown) to Anselm about the problem of concubinous priests in England exhorts Anselm to "fight manfully (*viriliter*) to the very end for the faith of Christ," in his battle to eradicate clerical marriage.¹⁹ John of Rheims, a monk of St. Evroul, after being promoted to the office of priest, "strove for perfection" and "taught others likewise to strive manfully (*viriliter*), both by his life and doctrine."²⁰ Under the guidance of Abbot Mainier, the monks of St. Evroul, persevered in their holy living, "fighting manfully (*viriliter*) against sin."²¹ Herbert of Losinga admonished his monks for their lackadaisical attitude toward building their cathedral. He portrayed hard work as a manly endeavor, telling the monks Ingulf, William, and Stanus to "persist untiringly in your work, let not your hand or foot rest, shiver in winter's cold, swelter under summer's sun, toil by day, watch by night. Gird yourselves and bear in mind those Israelites who, in repairing the walls of Jerusalem, fought with one hand and built with another. Persevere manfully (*viriliter*), labor faithfully, let the work go on fervently."²² When Bernard of Tiron was harassed by his fellow monks, one of whom used "abusive language" against him, the instigator was subsequently punished by a fatal illness. The rest of the men, frightened for their own lives, "thereafter manfully (*viriliter*) girded themselves for stricter observance of the rigor of monastic life."²³ And, while living in the wilderness of Tiron, outside the norms of society, Bernard "continuously behaved in a manly and steadfast manner."²⁴

The use of virile language commonly appears in descriptions of the battle against the flesh, more of which will be discussed below. Gerald of Wales, citing Jerome's commentary on the Gospel of Mark, argued that "That man is an Andrew, who, by manfully (*viriliter*), conquering his flesh, makes war on his own death . . . on his body whose passions are often the cause of his death

unless they are bridled.”²⁵ And, unbridled flesh, according to Gerald, was the cause of death for priests in particular.

Writers viewed the struggle for the proper behavior of the clergy and for the rights of the church as a manly act. The clergy of York lauded their archbishop-elect Thurstan for his behavior during his struggle to assume the episcopal see of York. In a letter to Thurstan, the clerics told him, “you have played the man (*viriliter egisti*).”²⁶ Gerald of Wales was able to protect his church from a neighboring bishop’s usurpation; and the local nobility and king lauded him for his behavior, the latter saying that the archdeacon “withstood him [the bishop] manfully and defended your Church right well.”²⁷ The archdeacon himself was not above reproaching others who had failed in their duties to correct clerical behavior in their dioceses. He told a council of Irish clergy that “if the prelates from the days of Patrick, through so many rolling years had manfully, as their office demands, given themselves to preaching and instruction and likewise to rebuke and chiding, then would they have rooted out some of the great enormities of the nation.”²⁸ Eadmer’s *Historia Novorum in Anglia* makes comparatively few uses of virile language, but, when he does, it is very suggestive.²⁹ For instance, when describing how the archbishop Lanfranc defended monks in his realm, he portrayed the archbishop as a manly adversary. Lanfranc first defended the monks of Winchester against the designs of Bishop Walkelin, who desired to expel the monastic clergy from the cathedral chapter and install secular clerics in their place. Then, according to Eadmer, the secular bishops of England conspired to remove the monks at Canterbury. Lanfranc would not permit this, and he “opposed it with all his might and stood out manfully (*viriliter*) against the pressure and enmity of them all.”³⁰

The defense of monastic leadership required the use of virile language. When Bernard of Tiron was preaching in Coutances, he was confronted by an archdeacon, his wife, and his children. The question, however, was not about clerical concubinage but about the right of monks to preach when they are supposed to be “dead to the world.” Clearly, many priests and secular clerics saw a vast difference between the clerical vocation and the monastic life. Bernard’s response was lengthy, drawing on biblical sources to defend his right to preach. In a thinly veiled criticism of Norman priests, Bernard drew on an analogy of hardness and softness. He admonished the archdeacon: “The preacher must have the strength of bone, because he must *manfully* (*viriliter*) resist sin and vice and bear hardship bravely in the defense of justice and holiness. The preacher must be harder than the soft flesh (*mollitie carnis*), because through harder ab-

stinence he must remove carnal delight in pleasure from his existence and way of life and must not weakly allow his mind to be enslaved by softening vices.”³¹

Virile language appears frequently in descriptions of competition between monastic and secular clerics. Hugh the Chanter, a York chronicler, utilized such terminology in his discussions of the primacy dispute between Canterbury and York. Hugh, a secular cleric and York member, pointed out that the monks of Canterbury nefariously planned to have the newly installed archbishop of York make a profession to Canterbury. Hugh said, “the monks of Canterbury do not cease to aim at and shamelessly demand what is unjust; they think on it while awake and dream of it in their sleep.”³² Hugh’s portrayal of this event suggested that leadership was an issue of manliness. About the archbishop of Canterbury, he said, “let him be a man (*viriliter*), let him [the archbishop of Canterbury] call our archbishop elect [of York] to Canterbury to be consecrated, and refuse to consecrate him till he has made his profession.”³³ Hugh’s chronicle also shows how the York clerics supported their archbishop, Thomas II, who was being pressured to make a profession of submission to Canterbury. The chapter reminded Thomas of how his predecessor refused to be cowed by the Canterbury contingent: “Look at Archbishop Gerard! How honest, how manly (*viriliter*), how excellent this action of his! He refused to sit in the council at London because Archbishop Anselm had been given a higher seat than himself, until a seat of equal dignity was made ready for him.”³⁴

To define manliness, religious writers used a gendered language, one emphasizing virile action. By underscoring the masculine nature of the religious life, Christian writers of the reform era presented the virility of ascetic values and the manliness of struggle. Feminized language, such as the maternal imagery of a mothering abbot/Jesus was not used in a more “public” discourse.

Becoming a “New Man”: The Hegemony of Ascetic Manliness

What did Christian writers mean when they called on celibate men to act “manfully”? Manly action was part of a process to adopt ascetic/monastic manliness; writers presented this often in the motif of the “new man,” derived from the New Testament letter to the Ephesians (“that he might create in himself one new man”).³⁵ In this manner, monastic writers particularly were able to highlight the superiority of the monastic life over the worldly; such assertions implied the superiority of monastic masculinity over clerical and aristocratic masculinity. In the context of eleventh and twelfth century Anglo-Norman religious writings,

to become a “new man” was to abandon all worldly ambitions and the secular life and to adopt monastic manliness. For many, this meant the assumption of a new masculine identity, one based on self-control and chastity. In fact, writers presented entrance into the monastic life as the adoption of a new bodily comportment, one that profoundly marked the male body as impenetrable, disciplined, and orderly. This narrative is most apparent in texts written by monastic writers. While it is true that many of these texts were intended for monastic audiences, others, like Orderic Vitalis’s *Ecclesiastical History*, were written for a literate audience of lay and religious. These texts conveyed a particular ideology of manliness that was defined by the ascetic male body.

At a time when many warriors entered monastic life, the theme of becoming a “new man” appeared frequently in monastic texts. From the eleventh century on, large numbers of knights entered monastic communities; as Katherine Smith has shown, their connection to their experiences of war was directly tied to the presentation of martial imagery in monastic texts.³⁶ Anselm, while abbot of Bec, wrote a letter to a young man, William, to advise him regarding his desire to follow his brother to Jerusalem. Anselm instead admonished him to join the service of Christ at Bec and become a “soldier of such a king,” abandoning worldly desires and embracing the “heavenly Jerusalem.”³⁷ Roger of Warrenne, a knight, was persuaded by the preaching of Gerold of Avranches to become a monk and enter St. Evroul with his fellow knights; Orderic called his profession to monasticism “like one escaping from the flames of Sodom.”³⁸

While scholars are very familiar with the motif of the warrior-turned-monk in medieval hagiography and other texts, I would suggest that this construct forms a larger narrative regarding the adoption of a superior form of manliness, a kind of persuasive rhetoric to reinforce this gender paradigm. Orderic Vitalis contributed to the “new man” model by presenting numerous illustrations of knights who renounced the world for monastic life, thereby asserting that monastic life was superior to the secular world. Orderic continued this motif by retelling the life of St. Guthlac, a seventh-century warrior, and, in doing so, set up a historical precedent for his readers; even in the distant past, manly warriors were conquered by the monastic life and took up a different, spiritual struggle. As a youth, Guthlac had given himself over to war and a warrior life, pillaging and destroying towns. One day he left his fellow warriors and entered a monastery, but finding this life to be lacking in the austerity he desired, Guthlac became a hermit, “where a man may wrestle with the enemy face-to-face.”³⁹ Other warriors saw the value in transferring military *virtu* to the spiri-

tual battlefield. Richard de Heudicourt, a knight from the Vexin, was wounded in battle, and, and on the advice of his lord, he decided "from that time forward to fight under the monastic rule by the practice of virtue (*virtutum*)."⁴⁰

Orderic was not the only writer to illustrate the knightly conversion to monasticism. Gilbert Crispin's *vita* of Herluin exemplifies the hegemony of monastic manliness and stresses how Herluin indeed became a "new man." Herluin, a Norman knight of the highest caliber, answered the call to monastic life around age thirty-seven.⁴¹ Praised for his fighting ability and his use of arms, Herluin was a model of warrior masculinity, a man that any knight of his day would admire. Gilbert's praise of Herluin as an ideal warrior enhanced his abandonment of the worldly life and his entrance into the contemplative one. In fact, Gilbert points out at the very beginning of Herluin's *vita* that in Normandy "it was considered a monstrosity for a healthy soldier to put aside his arms and become a monk,"⁴² clearly alluding to the cultural perception of Norman manliness. Gilbert presented Herluin's transition from a knight to a monk-in-training as his evolution into a "new man." Like his training for war, Herluin devoted himself to learning the life of a monk: he ate little during the day despite his engagement in manual labor and he spent his evenings memorizing the psalter and learning the alphabet. Herluin, we are told, believed that "the highest pinnacle of human life was the monastic order."⁴³ After Herluin finished the construction of his church, he took monastic vows and officially became a "brave soldier of Christ." Later, he also was ordained priest.⁴⁴

Elite men who embraced worldly values were not the only group portrayed as inferior to monks. Monks were frequently elevated above secular clerics in both vocation and behavior. The self-controlled moderation of monastic men was frequently portrayed in contrast to the disorderly clerics who lacked the proper qualities to govern. One tract written by twelfth-century Canterbury monks presents the distinction between these two groups by juxtaposing the biblical Jacob, who represented the monks, with his brother Esau, who represented the clerics. Esau exhibited a loss of self-control, while Jacob, the more orderly one, emerged as a leader. The writers reiterated that monks make better pastors because they are in better control of their bodies; monks live "chastely and soberly" (*caste et sobrie*). Their lives of austerity, discipline, learning, and prayer contrast sharply with the lax bodies of the parish clergy, men subject to drunkenness and fornication. This tract also argues that monks should lead clerics because clerics live "bestly and irrationally" (*bestialiter viventes et irrationaliter*).⁴⁵ Those who cannot control their bodies are not intended to lead.

In a similar manner, Orderic presents the superior nature of monastic bodies to their clerical counterparts, showing the transformation of clerics into monks. In his story about Fulk of Guernanville, he manages to demonstrate the admirable qualities of this man while offering the man's father, the infamous Fulk of Guernanville, as a contrasting model. Fulk the Younger's intelligence earned him the position of prior of St. Evroul, and his passion for the religious life was evident as he had convinced his own father to enter the monastery and donate most of his patrimony to the institution. As dean of Evreux, the senior Fulk had been a secular cleric and lived life in the manner that characterized his Norman contemporaries. His union with Orielde produced ten children. As Orderic points out, this was the custom since the time of Rollo, when "the practice of celibacy was so relaxed that not only priests but even bishops freely shared the beds of concubines and openly boasted of their numerous progeny of sons and daughters."⁴⁶ Yet Fulk willingly left the world, "turned his mind to better things," and "through the advice and admonitions of his son Fulk" entered monastic life.⁴⁷

Throughout his history, Orderic continually posits that the monastic life is stricter, more difficult, and, as a result, a higher state than that lived by secular clerics. As Orderic tells it, the canons of St. Evroul "gave way to the monks because they realized that the virtues (*virtutes*) of the monks were far greater than anything they could achieve."⁴⁸ Osbert, a well-educated monk, had been a canon at the cathedral chapter of Lisieux under Bishop Herbert (r. 1022–1049), but "wishing for a stricter way of life, he left the world" and entered the monastery of La-Trinité-du-Mont at Rouen.⁴⁹ Roger de Montgomery gave the abbey of Troarn to monks so that they could achieve a reform of the community. The twelve secular canons in residence had given themselves over to gluttony, fornication, and other worldly concerns; they were subsequently expelled. The monks established a strict rule at the abbey.⁵⁰ William of Rots, a secular cleric from Bayeux, who simultaneously held the positions of cantor, dean, and archdeacon, renounced the "pomp of the world" and became a monk at Caen.⁵¹

Other monastic writers also debated the question of religious orders and the state of perfection. An anonymous monastic writer from Bec began his treatise by first suggesting that the order of the priest was greater than that of the monk. But, in a carefully laid out argument, he ultimately showed that the monastic life was hegemonic to that of the priestly life. The writer distinguished between the two professions by offering that the office of the priesthood was greater in dignity to the monastic order; the monastic order, however, was

greater in evangelical perfection than the priesthood.⁵² The writer further elaborated his argument. While it is true that the priest handles the body of Christ, the priest also engages in secular affairs, which is prohibited to the monk. The writer made the point that “no man can fulfill so completely all the evangelical precepts in the way a monk can.”⁵³ In a further elaboration, he ultimately laid his claim on the superior nature of the chaste body. He continued that “it must be known among these that perfection of life rather than dignity of offices gives a place of greater merit, which we can point to in one instance. Intact virginity has the superior place among other virtues, after faith and martyrdom.”⁵⁴ The writer concluded his argument by offering that “a humble, continent person is of higher merit than a proud virgin. Thus a monk, though he may be of inferior office and dignity to a priest, is nevertheless greater in merit.”⁵⁵

Entrance into the monastic life led to a stricter life, and one became more masculinized as a result. For those who left this life, their bodies once again became penetrable, lax, and less manly. Religious writers, like the one from Bec, normalized this natural state of (gender) perfection. According to the Bec monk, many “ills” occurred when the monk left his profession and denied he was a monk; “no man of the world...makes an exhibition of himself with such impudence and lack of restraint as the monk who has abandoned the habit of his holy order and utterly denied he is a monk.”⁵⁶ He added that “the monastic order once entered cannot be left in any way for any reason without damnation of the soul. Hence those who are promoted from this order to the prelacy certainly ought not and dare not abandon the monastic habit. And if at some time or other they dress outwardly in other clothing, nevertheless they always wear the monastic habit underneath.”⁵⁷ Presumably, this was a way of girding their body, rendering it impenetrable as they faced the secular world.

Writers expressed the grave consequences that occurred when clerics abandoned the monastic life for the world. Orderic Vitalis describes the case of a priest, Ansered, who had entered a monastic community when ill but, after his recovery, decided to leave and return to the secular world. He consorted with a prostitute and, being unsatisfied with that tryst, then had sex with another woman. This woman betrayed the priest with another cleric. Ansered caught them in bed together, and the cleric killed Ansered with an axe, later dumping his body, which was then dismembered by wild animals. Ansered’s body exhibited such a strong degree of putrefaction that no one would go near it.⁵⁸ Similarly, William of Malmesbury recounted the story of the bishop Aelfheah, who ordained three monks to the priesthood only to find that one of them,

Aethelstan, "later threw off the monastic habit, rejected celibacy, and died in the arms of a whore."⁵⁹ William, like Orderic, established the connection between the impenetrability of the male body marked by the state of chaste perfection that, through rejection of that state, became penetrable and disorderly.

How did this promotion of the "new man" affect those who were raised inside monastery walls? Child oblates lacked the ability to transform themselves, but religious writers found a way to explain their sanctity. Child oblates who grew up with ascetic values, surrounded by examples of monastic living, may have acquired a religious male identity more easily. Unable to reference secular manliness in a household or on a battlefield, these young boys may have been at an advantage in acquiring an appropriate masculine identity. Adult converts had to conquer the ingrained notions of gender identity from secular life in order to abandon the world and enter a monastic community, and writers highlighted the significance of that transformation. Yet child oblates represented to some the purity of monastic life, untainted by the outside world. The position of monastic writers on the subject of child oblates varied. One way child oblates were included in the "new man" motif was by emphasis on their monastic tendencies as children. Orderic Vitalis recounts numerous examples of child oblates who were models of monastic living. Some notable monastic reformers were identified in youth as having an extraordinary propensity for the contemplative life. Orderic Vitalis, himself a child oblate, emphasized the sanctity of those who were raised in the monastic life. For example, Reginald had been entrusted to the monastery of St. Evroul at five and was a good model of monasticism for the next fifty-two years.⁶⁰ William, son of Guy Bolleyn, a knight, entered St. Evroul at nine; he was a monk for fifty-four years, and a model one at that. Orderic writes that "carefully brought up in the bosom of holy mother church, and removed from all worldly strife and carnal lust, he distinguished himself in those kinds of knowledge that are more useful to sons of the church."⁶¹ Thus, while becoming a "new man" is frequently linked to a conversion from worldly life to monastic living, some well-known monastics were included in the paradigm of religious manliness by their propensity at a young age for the monastic life.

The Dangers of Effeminacy

Just as the "new man" motif served to bolster monastic manliness as superior to clerical (and lay) manliness, there emerged another narrative technique de-

signed to sharpen this distinction: the labeling of actions, behavior, and appearance deemed effeminate. The effeminate was one who gave into women sexually or one who became womanish through sex with men. This model posed many problems for Norman laymen and priests alike, as it seemingly devalued traditional marriage and procreation, cultural features of secular manliness. By normalizing religious celibacy, monastic writers problematized both procreative and nonprocreative sexuality. They characterized both lay and clerical bodies as disorderly through their sexual behavior, so that the elite at court, as well as married clerics, were rendered womanish or effeminate and, as a result, unable to govern effectively.

Religious writers depicted reformers in control of defining manliness during this period, not only the manly behavior of the clergy but also that of laymen. The following examples show the transformative moments when religious men corrected the gender performances of elite laymen and, in doing so, established themselves as the definers of masculinity for all men. For example, Anselm was quite bothered by effeminate behavior, both by the laity and the clergy. Eadmer describes how Anselm sought to masculinize the king's court, particularly William Rufus's courtiers, by reprimanding those who walked with an effeminate gait and wore their hair in the manner of women. Anselm preached against this custom successfully, and the men cut their hair and adopted a "manly bearing (*virilem*)."⁶²

Appearance could profoundly affect behavior. Anselm's great concern over masculine appearance found its way into the canons of Westminster in 1102. While four of the canons from this council concerned celibacy of the clergy, three others regulated appearance and other behavior. Canon 13 declared clerics should wear an appropriate tonsure, while canon 11 attempted to regulate wearing of brightly colored clothing, which was likely a safeguard against luxurious fabrics.⁶³ Some scholars have noted the link between such fabrics, *luxuria*, and femininity. William of Malmesbury felt it necessary to offer the example of the saint Aldhelm, who warned his student against associating with prostitutes; in addition to the sexual danger they posed, prostitutes had a tendency to wear brightly colored clothing. The saint also believed that such luxurious clothing could "emasculate his mental vigour."⁶⁴ Not only could the male clerical body be effeminized through wearing certain fabrics, but so could the mind.

Other sources also point to the role that reforming bishops played in setting the standard for manly behavior and appearance, especially when secular men, kings, knights, and nobles, failed to maintain their manliness. Serlo, bishop of

Sées, admonished King Henry I in 1105 at Carentan for his and his courtiers' unkempt appearances. In particular, they were rebuked for wearing their hair in a "woman's fashion"; instead, the bishop told them to "use your strength like men (*virili robore perfrui debetis*)."⁶⁵ After admonishing the king and his men for having long beards reminiscent of "he-goats," Serlo continued: "by growing their hair long they make themselves seem like imitators of women, and by womanly softness (*mollicie*) they lose their manly strength (*virili fortitudine*) and are led to sin."⁶⁵ The reformer deployed the language of hardness and softness to correspond with manliness and femininity. Bishop Serlo also pointed out the effeminacy present in the habit of wearing *poulaines*, shoes with curved tips: "The perverse sons of Belial grow the tresses of women on their heads, and deck their toes (*pedum suorum*) with the tails of scorpions, revealing themselves to be effeminates by their softness (*molliciem femineos*) and serpent-like by their scorpion stings."⁶⁶ Once Serlo's speech was concluded, the king and his men were so inspired by his words that they stepped forward and willingly had their hair shorn by the bishop. The king was transformed by this gender reinforcement, as he then went on, as Orderic Vitalis narrates, and "wreaked vengeance manfully (*viriliter*) on the enemies of the Church of God."⁶⁷

The reformer Wulfstan of Worcester also took measures to establish what he considered to be a proper masculine appearance. According to William of Malmesbury, Wulfstan carried a pocket knife with him so that, when the occasion struck him, he could cut off the locks of men with long hair. To anyone who protested, Wulfstan would accuse of effeminacy: "men who blushed to be what they had been born, and let their hair flow like women, would be no more use than women in the defence of their country against the foreigner." This failure to practice correct masculinity was used as a reason the Normans were successful in their conquest of England.⁶⁸

Medieval society exhibited a strong degree of discomfort with inverted gender performances; manly women and womanly men disrupted normative gender relations.⁶⁹ In this regard, writers viewed effeminacy and sodomy as equitable offenses against manliness, although not all conflated the two behaviors. Frequently, reformers equated effeminacy with a man's overwhelming indulgence in women, but effeminacy could also be linked to sodomy, as in the history of Orderic Vitalis, who portrayed both as highly undesirable traits. His description of William Rufus's court also displayed the same revulsion at men acting womanish and women sexually dominating men. Orderic said that "at that time effeminates (*effeminati*) set the fashion in many parts of the world:

foul catamites (*catamitae*) doomed to eternal fire, unrestrainedly pursued their revels and shamelessly gave themselves up to the filth of sodomy." His link to womanish behavior and appearance is made clear in the following passages, when he described how the courtiers "grew long and luxurious locks like women" and he lamented that "our wanton youth is sunk in effeminacy, and courtiers, fawning, seek the favours of women with every kind of lewdness." This was not always the custom, Orderic remarked; in a previous era, "our ancestors used to wear decent clothes, well-adapted to the shape of their bodies; they were skilled horsemen and swift runners, ready for all seemly undertakings."⁷⁰

The lack of proper masculine performance had wider-reaching consequences than simply the decadence of court. It spelled disaster for proper governance and leadership. Orderic recorded the prophecy of a hermit who predicted that Rufus's brother, Robert Courthose, would fail as an effective ruler and "catamites and effeminates will govern, and under their rule vice and wretchedness will abound."⁷¹ Catamites and womanish men failed at proper governance because of their abnormal gender performances. The laxity of their bodies and their unrestrained sexual proclivities rendered them unsuitable for governance; from their disorderly bodies, disorder ensued.

Other writers also located the origins of disorder and disaster in incorrect gender performances. Henry of Huntingdon thought that the wreck of the White Ship in 1120 was due to the sodomy of the Anglo-Norman court. In his *History*, he writes that the king's heirs all perished because "all of them, or nearly all, were said to be tainted with sodomy and they were snared and caught. Behold the glittering vengeance of God!...And so death suddenly devoured those who had deserved it."⁷² Henry's commentary suggests that sodomy at court was still a persistent problem, even years after Eadmer first commented on it.

William of Malmesbury also noted, like Eadmer and Orderic Vitalis, the decadent fashions of William Rufus's court, although William not only provided greater detail of the problem with men's fashions, he also underscored how courtiers had rejected their innate masculinity. He noted that the courtiers wore "flowing hair and extravagant dress" along with the infamous *poulaines*. William noted that "the model for young men was to rival women in delicacy of person, to mince their gait, to walk with loose gesture, and half naked. Enervated (*enerves*) and effeminate (*emolliti*), they unwillingly remained what nature had made them; the assailers of others' chastity, prodigal of their own. Troops of pathics, and droves of harlots, followed the court (*sequebantur curiam*

effeminatorum manus et ganeorum greges).⁷³ In his *Historia Novella*, William also mentions the “wearers of long hair who, forgetting what they were born, enjoy transforming themselves to look like women.” William suggests that Anselm had tried to correct these problems, blocked by the will of his suffragan bishops.⁷⁴ William of Malmesbury’s disdain is apparent. This monastic writer held a particular ideal of masculinity that some of the elite, especially the courtiers, failed to uphold.

William’s praise of correct masculine performance extended even to the secular clergy, of whom he was not fond. Yet even in a secular cleric, like Thomas, archbishop of York, chastity and manliness could easily coincide. William lauded Thomas of York for his strength of character, his recruitment of educated clergy and his commitment to chastity. Furthermore Thomas was skilled in music, and particularly concerned that his clerics “maintain a masculine type of music in church, and not give anything an effeminate turn”⁷⁵ (*ut masculam in aeclesia musicam haberent, nec quicquam effeminate defringentes tenero*).

Clerics could be rendered effeminate through the practice of sodomy, but more frequently religious critics attributed the effeminacy of such men to their sexual domination by women. The same Canterbury monks who had attributed a lack of reason and disorderliness to secular clerics also highlighted the effeminacy of these men. To show why monks were more suitable for ordination than secular clerics, the writers of this tract made the point over and over again that secular clerics were sexually dominated by women. The tract takes aim at the parish clergy, many of whom were described as “vagabond” priests, men more similar to locusts than to clerics (*locustis similes*). Should these men rule over monks, the writers questioned? They, with their long, unruly beards (*barbis rostratos*), curled hair (*crinibus calamistratos*), effeminate clothing (*vestibus effeminatos*), and distorted, curved feet (*distortisque pedibus unguatos*)?⁷⁶ Ministers should be full of divine grace, chastely and soberly ministering at their churches and abstaining from sexual intercourse, from eating meat and from wearing soft and luxurious clothing,⁷⁷ all practices consistent with manly asceticism. They boldly asserted that priests should be making spiritual sons by teaching with devotion and by preaching; the priest has more than enough to do than to make sons through fornication.⁷⁸ Not only do parish clerics give their church revenue to their concubines and children, but they also create public spectacles by taking their women, decked out lavishly in fine clothing and jewels, to weddings and to church.⁷⁹

The description of priests’ concubines shows a link between fine clothing

and dangerous female sexuality, both which corrupts the manly vigor of the priest. Similarly, the writer of an Old English homily laid out the gender inversion that occurs when priests served their wives, and not their churches: "for the lay men honoureth his spouse with clothes more than himself, and the priest not so his church, which is his spouse, but adorns his servant, which is his whore, with clothes more than himself. The church cloths are utterly rent and old, and his woman's must be whole and new."⁸⁰ These writers clearly saw these priests as men conquered by women, and that, in turn, rendered them effeminate. An effeminate appearance, a womanly demeanor, and domination by a woman all had consequences for the masculine identity of priests, rendering them inferior to the masculinity of monks.

Aside from the genre of chronicles, religious writers expressed similar sentiments in their letters and polemical texts. The archdeacon Gerald of Wales, writing in the late twelfth century, displayed the same level of contempt for effeminate behavior. His disgust for the canon Reginald Foliot is well documented and seemingly based on both Reginald's androgynous appearance and perverse sexual proclivities. According to Gerald, Reginald was "a creature of fawning manners and lisping speech, so wholly beardless that from outward view none could tell whether he were man or woman," a description similar to Eadmer's Norman courtiers.⁸¹ In another passage, Gerald continued to assault Reginald's manliness, only this time by implying that the canon lacked self-control. His letter to archbishop Hubert Walter of Canterbury illustrates that Reginald was an inappropriate candidate for the bishopric of St. David's because "a short time ago he was an unchaste boy, and now that he has come to manhood, is a slave to every lust, witness the children of either sex that have recently been born to him and are still squalling in their cradles."⁸² To discredit him as a candidate worthy of an episcopal seat, the very position so desired by the archdeacon himself, Gerald suggested implicitly that Reginald both was unmanly and lacked self-control.

Many ecclesiastical writers used the lack of sexual self-control to discredit their opponents; this had the effect of smearing the reputation, justly or not, of their opponent but also of reaffirming their particular notions of religious manliness. Arnulf, the archdeacon of Sées, and later bishop of Lisieux, wrote such a tract against Gerald, the bishop of Angoulême (1102–1136), a prelate who supported the schismatic pope Anacletus and who served him as his papal legate to France. The pamphlet, *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem Episcopum*, was a particularly venomous piece, attacking Gerald and his favored

papal candidate with suggestions of clerical incontinence, bestiality, incest, and complicity in a rape. Arnulf began his polemic by questioning Gerald's commitment to the Church, suggesting that he appeared to be a "soldier of Christ" while in fact he was not.⁸³ Arnulf then launched into the more substantial realm of his attack by describing an incident that may not have occurred. He accused Gerald of being complicit in the rape of an abbess by an archdeacon in his diocese; the abbess later gave birth to a child, conceived in the attack. As bishop, Gerald had not punished the archdeacon.⁸⁴ After pointing out Gerald's inability to govern his diocese in disciplining errant clergy, Arnulf proceeded to use the case as an example of Gerald's uncontrolled passions. In questioning Gerald's authority, Arnulf stated that, because Gerald was "intemperate and lustful in important matters," he would be the same in items of minor importance.⁸⁵ Referring to the rape of the abbess as a kind of spiritual "incest," Arnulf questioned whether Gerald would not also commit "simple fornication or rape" because he was not bothered by the "filth of someone else's crime."⁸⁶

Arnulf's attack on Anacletus was especially vicious. He accused Anacletus of committing "bestial incest" with his sister and having sons born from "this abominable monstrosity." Next, perhaps in an attempt further to underscore Anacletus's perversity, Arnulf asserted that Anacletus travelled with a young woman as a sexual companion. Perhaps for concealment, Anacletus tonsured her head, dressed her as a man, so that "both sexes seemed to be set forth in the same body." Yet Arnulf's description suggests that this was more than an attempt at secrecy; the antipope had perverse sexual inclinations.⁸⁷ Sexual control and manly demeanor were crucial elements of religious leadership. Religious writers used accusations such as these to emphasize the effeminate nature of these clerics, their lack of sexual self-control, and inability to govern.

Sexualizing Chastity

How did one avoid effeminacy? How might a cleric render himself more manly? Promoters of religious manliness had one answer: sexualized chastity. During the reform era, religious writers masculinized celibacy and the celibate male body in their presentation of chastity and holy virginity. If monastic writers from this period believed that the extension of the celibacy mandate to all clerics in major orders lessened their own special spiritual condition of holy virginity, the sources speak to the contrary. Nor did Anglo-Norman writers, in their promotion of chastity, suggest that there was an "ontological asexuality" that

centrally defined monastic life.⁸⁸ In fact, sexualized chastity, the sexual struggle for abstinence, served a useful purpose in the gender paradigm of the reform movement. Writers remasculinized the male body through performance of the struggle against the flesh. In short, they compensated the loss of coitus with another performance of manliness, one that demonstrated that the male body was still functional but did not jeopardize the health of the soul. To renounce sex, to fight sexual desire, one needed to experience the sexualized body.

Beginning around 1050, many of the themes found in ancient and patristic sources on the issue of bodily purity and celibacy reappeared in monastic discourse. Those who favored celibacy for the priesthood made use of these older rhetorical devices to convince the priesthood that life-long chastity was the key to religious manliness. This rhetoric presented chastity as a notable military-style struggle, performed only by physically intact men, and suggested that the sexual relations of the priest polluted the altar and sacrament. Such behavior also polluted the priestly body, rendering it disorderly and dysfunctional.

Christian writers of the late Roman period had struggled with effective ways to resolve sexual urges, which they believed had the potential to corrupt the body. This denial of the flesh was key to spiritual salvation but could not include physical castration, which was the cowardly solution to the battle against the flesh. Instead, they urged a spiritual castration for those who wanted to meet Christ's appeal to become "eunuchs for heaven." The discomfort over physical castration was related to the gender ambiguity that ensued. Castrated men were not physically male, yet they were not women either. This collective sentiment was first expressed at the Council of Nicea (325), where religious authorities asserted their disapproval of those who maimed themselves; the council decreed that clerical eunuchs must be removed from their benefices. Ambrose of Milan and Jerome both expressed similar beliefs that there was manliness found in spiritual castration, but not in actual physical castration. They reasoned that those who castrated themselves spiritually were able to abstain from sexual relations by choice, whereas those physically castrated were unable to choose. The man who chose spiritual castration was able to abstain by sheer will. He fought constantly against sexual temptation, which made him stronger and more manly than those who never experienced sexual desires. The "manly eunuch," thus, became the monk who embodied the ideal of spiritual castration.⁸⁹

The Anglo-Norman reform-era position on physical castration remained consistent with ancient doctrines, although it was likely more influenced by the

Norman practice of castrating political enemies. The significance of castration as a political punishment exemplifies this perception of manliness and physical potency. Klaus van Eickels has noted that, when William the Conqueror set castration as a penalty for treason, he established the precedent for later Anglo-Norman rulers to destroy the manhood of their enemies.⁹⁰ This measure reflected the underlying cultural emphasis on masculinity: castration removed a man's procreative function and deprived him of his ability to participate in the kinship network that was so profoundly important to Normans.⁹¹ The Norman use of castration on political enemies reflected the culture's emphasis on manhood, governance, and political power; when castration was used elsewhere in medieval Europe, it was generally only employed as punishment for sexual offenses.⁹² Castration spelled dishonor for Normans, for it deprived them of their key social identity: being a man.

Norman rulers applied this form of dishonor to religious men, vowed celibates who, theoretically, did not engage in sexual intercourse. Geoffrey of Anjou asserted his political power over the church of Sées by castrating the bishop-elect Gerard and his clerics; he did so to punish the clerics for failing to consult him on the episcopal election.⁹³ Geoffrey's act recognized Gerard's potency, as a religious leader and as a man. Although Gerard was presumably celibate, this factor meant little to the duke. His violent action showed that he, like other laymen, viewed clerics as men and viewed physical emasculation as a viable form of retribution. The entire castration narrative underscores that Geoffrey of Anjou, and his social equals (warrior elites), saw male genitalia as the seat of power. The removal of these genitalia signified, to Geoffrey at least, the loss of male potency.

Since the temptation of the flesh presented a constant battle for the celibate, it was a necessary aspect of proving religious manliness, whether the spiritual warrior was a priest, monk, or bishop. Preventing this battle through castration removed the potential for manhood. William of Malmesbury presented an anecdote in his *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* that underscored that even religious men could not tolerate castration. Hugh d'Orvial was appointed bishop of London but, after ordination, fell ill with blisters all over his body; to quell this illness, he had his testicles removed. Due to this "shameful remedy," William writes, Hugh had to endure "the slur (*obprobrium*) of being a eunuch."⁹⁴ By castration, Hugh put an end to one crucial masculine performance: conquering sexual desires over and over again. Rather than castration, physicians frequently advocated sexual intercourse as a remedy for certain kinds of illness. This in

part illustrates that Anglo-Norman society, like others, viewed sex as a necessity for a balance of the humors, a view that could be problematic for religious celibates.⁹⁵ Maurice, bishop of London, was advised by physicians to relieve his illness by "the emission of humours." Maurice, known for "self-indulgent love of women," was criticized by William of Malmesbury, for "he was indeed unlucky to have to safeguard the flesh by endangering his soul."⁹⁶

William's condemnation of castration and sexual intercourse illustrates that the only course available to religious celibates, eager to guard their chastity, was to fight the desires of the flesh, even to the point of death. Thomas II, archbishop of York (d.1114), died from his refusal to accept a sexual remedy for his illness. Although he first consented to the treatment, which involved sex with a beautiful woman, his physicians later discovered he had remained chaste. Thomas defended his actions by saying "woe upon a remedy which requires lust (*luxuria*) for its cure."⁹⁷ Then he died. In a similar case, the archdeacon of Louvain was elected to the episcopal see of that city, although he desired to remain in his present position. He initially refused the position because he questioned his own commitment to lifelong chastity. He proclaimed that, if he could not be chaste, "he would be far more tolerable and less likely to be damned in his archdeacon's post" than he would as bishop. Nonetheless, after his episcopal consecration, the archdeacon began to experience genital swelling, "with immeasurable flatulence" (it was believed that excessive gas could cause erections!).⁹⁸ Believing the cause of his illness to be sexual abstinence, those around him advised him to have intercourse. The cleric, wary of his failure to be continent as an archdeacon, refused to stain the dignity of his episcopal office with sexual activity. He later died, after "he resisted temptation *manfully* (*viriliter*) and, although conquered in the body, emerged victorious in the spirit for Christ."⁹⁹

Remedies other than sexual intercourse could quell carnal desire. Gerald of Wales preached that priests should not only avoid dining in the presence of women but that they should mortify the stomach and genitals through abstinence, due to the close proximity of these organs. Sometimes more extreme measures were warranted. In retelling the story of the hermit Godric, Gerald explained that the saint was overcome by lust and abstained for a full week to quell his "illicit urgings." But, unable to stifle his passions and subjected to involuntary ejaculation, he finally threw himself into a thorny briar patch like St. Benedict. When this too failed to produce the intended result, he immersed himself in icy, cold water; at last, he "extinguished the passion which frequently raged in him."¹⁰⁰ This story brings to the forefront what Jacqueline Murray called the "problem of male embodiment."¹⁰¹

The conflict present within the religious male body provoked some monastic writers to offer an alternative possibility: mystical castration. Gerald of Wales presents a story from the patristic era, when a monk by the name of Eliah created a monastery for women. After two years of ministering to the nuns, he suddenly began to experience carnal temptation. Terribly disturbed by his own thoughts, he fled to the wilderness to fast for two days and pray for an end to this temptation. One night in his sleep, Eliah was visited by three angels, who seized him, held him down, and “mystically” cut off his testicles with a knife. Afterward, Eliah reported feeling that a great burden had been lifted from him. He was able to lead this community of women as a fully intact male, without ever experiencing carnal temptation again.¹⁰²

Religious writers underscored that choosing chastity was not the same as choosing impotence, physical or social. The chaste, celibate body was still sexually functional, so long as it had not been physically castrated. Various episodes narrated in these texts clearly demonstrate that the male celibate still experienced sexual desires, manifested by his erections and ejaculations; his body was still responsive. The celibate male’s struggle was to fight his own nature, his sexual desires, and, in that moment, become remasculinized. Gerald of Wales was an advocate of celibacy, and his numerous discussions of sexual behavior created a discourse on sexuality that served to incite desire. His recollection of stories could be seen as discursive reenactments of the war against the flesh, his flesh certainly and those of his readers.¹⁰³ He stands as an example of how religious writers transformed clerical sexuality from the site of practice to the site of the imagination, all the while maintaining their chaste bodies.

Gerald was aware that young monks may have experienced sexual temptation more frequently, due to their youthful vigor. In his *Gemma*, he presents a letter written from Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans, to an abbot, who reported a curious problem with one of his young monks. It appeared that the monk in question was having problems with involuntary seminal emission. Bishop Hildebert was more skeptical as to the monk’s culpability:

You say that when your confrere is prostrate for the sake of praying, an evil spirit approaches him, places its hands on his genital organs, and does not stop rubbing his body with its own until he is so agitated that he is polluted by an emission of semen. You say also that this apparition does not bother him in his thoughts or in his sleep.

This experience takes place while he is praying and is done by [what seems to be] truly a man's hand.¹⁰⁴

The bishop was informed that the young monk had followed all the rules, that he was a "virgin, that he has never eaten cooked meat, and that he has avoided the vices of the flesh." Nonetheless, he expressed skepticism that this event was involuntary and the result of an evil spirit. He advised the abbot to have the monk "examine his conscience carefully, and if he finds that he has fought the temptation manfully (*viriliter*), let him continue to pray." If, the monk finds he is, in fact, consenting to such masturbation, "let him pray more devoutly . . . let him pursue the path of sacred fasting, let him weep in his bed every night, let him undertake frequent and grave penances, let him chastise his body as Paul did and bring it into subjection."¹⁰⁵ In order to explain why this righteous monk would face such temptation, Gerald explains that "this temptation was given, therefore, either to augment the youth's merits (provided he resisted manfully (*viriliter*), without giving any consent) or to increase his punishment (if he had given, perhaps, some slight consent)."¹⁰⁶

The fight against the flesh appeared often in religious texts as a military battle, underscoring the traditional presentations of vowed celibates as soldiers of Christ (*milites Christi*). The notion of monks as *milites Christi* is so well established in monastic literature that it is unnecessary to supply an extensive discussion of the model. Katherine Smith's excellent study has already shown that military imagery was profoundly central to male monastic life during the age of reform.¹⁰⁷ The monk as soldier was not an asexual being; he was, instead, a warrior who defended his vow of chastity. The group of monks behind an 1132 polemic portrayed the monastic life in such a manner. While the use of such metaphors in this tract can be connected to ancient monastic literature, its presence here was clearly intended to create a masculinized monastic life, centered around the battle against carnal desire. For example, the writers devote a considerable amount of this tract to arguing that monks form an elite military corps. Using well-known biblical passages, these monks argue that a soldier should not get involved in civilian affairs, especially the vices of the flesh; after all, good soldiers [monks] fight the "good fight."¹⁰⁸ By this argument, they set up an anti-norm of the religious male body, the clerical body that engaged in fornication and concubinage. They further argue that the faithful in the Church, undoubtedly referencing priests, "ought to imitate the virtues and work of holy

men manfully (*viriliter*).¹⁰⁹ The monk-soldier, dominated by ascetic self-control, defends the citadel of God with his brethren and stands in stark contrast to the disorderly priestly body.

Military imagery was most powerful when it was tightly connected to the battle against the flesh. Ecclesiastical writers overarticulated this struggle against the flesh in all genres of writings. Gerald of Wales positioned the *agon* (struggle) as a continuous battle against the flesh in his *Gemma Ecclesiastica*. He reminds his readers that “it is the outcome, not the battle, which is crowned. Victory is crowned after the day’s battle.” In criticism of those clerics who wait until old age to commit to the religious life, out of fear they will be unable to remain continent, Gerald lectures that “no crown is given unless the struggle of a fierce battle has taken place. It is highly praiseworthy if they restrained themselves in the heat and passion of youth. Thus might they exercise the rule of reason over their reluctant flesh and chastise their body . . . otherwise they will wallow in unbridled wantonness.”¹¹⁰ Gerald believed that life on earth was an eternal battle with the “enemy” and so posed this question:

who is more victorious—he who overcomes the enemy after a severe struggle and long battle, or he who immediately and powerfully triumphs over him in the first stages of the struggle? . . . The enemy is conquered by force and overcome by strength if he is overthrown immediately, without delay. He who dallies and at length begins to do battle seems hardly likely to win.¹¹¹

Continuing on from his discussion of patristic authors, Gerald reiterates some of the ideas found in these ancient texts. He advises those who struggle against their sexual urges to do what early fathers like Jerome and Augustine did: “If, therefore, you are tempted and troubled as these men were, resist manfully (*viriliter*) and do battle as they did, in order that you may receive the crown which they received and for a temporary struggle receive everlasting rewards.” Quoting St. Paul, Gerald urges, “No one will receive the crown unless he strives manfully.” He follows with a quote from St. Jerome: “You are an effeminate (*delicates*) soldier if you hope to be crowned without a battle.”¹¹² Gerald further underscores that those “servants,” undoubtedly referencing priests, “are effeminate and deserving of reproach who, having given themselves over to every excess, refuse to follow their Lord through difficulties and hardships.” He concludes his argument by stating that, if one cannot die for Christ, “let us at least carry

it in the other two ways (by being compassionate and by disciplining the body and manfully (*viriliter*) resisting temptations)."¹¹³

The battle against the flesh was so important for priests because many writers believed the purity of the altar and sacrament was at stake. Monastic writers made great use of the motif of the fornicating priest who polluted the altar through his licentious behavior. Here the connection between the priestly body and the Christ body was conveyed. Despite the frequency of this concept, that priests taint the altar and sacrament by their sexual behavior, ecclesiastical authorities were not unified on this position. Anselm of Canterbury did believe that a corruption of the sacrament could occur if an impure priest ministered at the altar. In a letter to William, abbot of Fécamp, Anselm advised the abbot to uphold the rule of clerical celibacy because those priests who minister at the altars "do not serve, but pollute them by their very presence."¹¹⁴ Pope Paschal's letter (1102) to Anselm illustrates the problem with removing such priests from their churches. Paschal advised Anselm that when there was imminent death, it was better to receive the sacrament from the hand of a fornicating priest than to do without the sacrament entirely because no suitable priest could be found.¹¹⁵

Several months later, Anselm himself was in a position to advise Gerard, archbishop of York, on the same matter. Gerard's chief complaint was that the priests and deacons who had wives and concubines were still serving at the altar. In addition, some rebellious clerics claimed they had violated no laws, since the Council of Westminster had only barred them from cohabitating with women, not from meeting with them in the homes of their neighbors. Regarding the consecration of the Host, Gerard said these men "long carried out these things within the filth of lust so that they repeatedly go back and forth, publicly, from the beds of their concubines to the altar, and then from the altar to the beds of wickedness." Furthermore, Gerard stated he had trouble getting clerics to ascend the higher orders because "they resist me with stiff necks in case they should have to profess chastity at their ordination."¹¹⁶ These sentiments were echoed by Geoffrey Grossus, hagiographer of Bernard of Tiron, who described the concubinous priests of Normandy as binding themselves to a life of fornication and, as a result, "never to approach the body and blood of Christ except as unworthy criminals."¹¹⁷

Some writers believed bodily impurity could be alleviated by periodic abstinence. Gerald of Wales believed a period of sexual abstinence before consecration of the Host could mitigate the sexual corruption of the sacrament. While Gerald admonished unchaste priests, he also appealed to them to remain

chaste for at least three days before consecrating the Host. He asked, "let the priest who lives and rolls about as if in his own pig-pen of impurity show at least this reverence to the sacred altar and to the Eucharist." Gerald shunned to think, however, that three days was not enough to cleanse the impurity of unchaste priests, who "pollute themselves by fornication and concubinage." For this reason, he argued that "they ought to shun not only concubinage, but also cohabitation with women."¹¹⁸ In another section of the *Gemma*, he bluntly questions, "How will a priest who does not abhor to arise every morning from the bed of a damnable harlot or of a culpable concubine to consecrate and receive the greatest and most worthy of all sacraments shun any other vice?"¹¹⁹ Using a story told about Hugh of Lincoln, Gerald makes the point that priests are particularly susceptible to fornication: "We must resist, therefore, with all our manliness (*viribus*). If we courageously and faithfully apply our spiritual arms and our minds against spiritual evils, we will be victorious against the attacks of the clever enemy."¹²⁰ Priests must overcome their weaknesses, and "resist the desires of the flesh manfully (*viriliter*) . . . the greater the struggle, the greater the crown."¹²¹ Gerald encapsulated the battle against the flesh as a masculine performance, leaving no doubt that religious celibacy was manly.

Religious writers of the reform period in England and Normandy conceived of manliness as an epic battle for sexual self-control. The discipline of the male body was always the centrally defining feature of monastic manliness, but it would be further extended to the secular clergy by way of celibacy legislation. The language of virility described those in religious orders as manly, in thought, action, and appearance. Throughout many texts, monastic writers posited their superior manliness against the lax, softened bodies of courtiers and priests. Chastity was the key to achieving religious manliness, but it depended on a sexualized body, one that could continually fight the desires of the flesh. Sexualized chastity allowed the chaste body to remain virile and, by extension, manly. A cleric rendered himself effeminate or "softened" by allowing women to dominate him and being subject to uncontrollable lust. As Chapter 2 will illustrate, it was this model of masculinity that intersected with the implementation of antimarriage laws for the secular clergy.

Chapter 2



Legal Discourse and the Reality of Clerical Marriage

In the year 1072, the reforming archbishop of Rouen, John d'Avranches, tried to enforce the 1064 canons of Lisieux at a provincial synod. Orderic Vitalis is the only chronicler to document the reaction of the clergy to the news that they could no longer have wives:

For ten years he fulfilled his duties as metropolitan with courage and thoroughness, continuously striving to separate immoral priests from their mistresses (*pelicibus*): on one occasion when he forbade them to keep concubines (*concubinas*) he was stoned out of the synod, and fled exclaiming in a loud voice: "O God, the heathens are come into thine inheritance."¹

This episode of priestly resistance was not unique in the region. It shows the vast difference between reformers and the priesthood they hoped to reform. Sexualized chastity and the ideology of the manly celibate must have appeared as strange concepts for the Anglo-Norman clergy as it did for the laity. Ecclesiastical reform was not just contrary to the practice of clerical marriage in Normandy and England; it enforced laws that went against the very fabric of traditional conceptions of manliness. Efforts to enforce sacerdotal celibacy may have begun in the early eleventh century, but clerics in these regions continued to marry like other men in their communities. How effective these early reform efforts were across Europe is not known, but Anglo-Norman clerics did not immediately put aside their wives on hearing of the first Roman decree on mandated celibacy.

In Normandy, monastic chastity and clerical marriage coexisted as two sides to religious life. Normandy produced and supported monastic revivals in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, while also supporting the tradition of clerical marriages. This was the climate of the Church until reformers like Lanfranc, John d'Avranches, and Anselm, among others, crossed the lines between the two ecclesiastical career paths, disseminating the model that made one vocation (monastic) the ideal for the other (clerical). Until the war on clerical marriage began, clerics lived like other men in their communities; they married, they had children, and they practiced a gender identity more similar to laymen than to monks. The laws prohibiting clerical marriage forced clerics into a dilemma, a choice between their marriage and their livelihood. Aside from the emotional aspects of separation, forsaking one's wife deprived the priest of his social status in his local community, for it removed one of the perceived markers of adult male identity. It also forced the cleric to delegitimize his children publicly. A priest who refused clerical celibacy could theoretically lose his livelihood and impoverish his family.

Married clerics' noncompliance with celibacy is indicative of their attitude toward the laws and the reformers themselves. The papacy may have been preaching against "fornicating" priests and their "whores" since 1059, a message enhanced by such notables as Peter Damian, but a different reality existed for Anglo-Norman priests and the secular clergy in general, a reality in which marriage formed a legitimate part of their lives and contributed to their masculine status in their communities. The ideal of the manly celibate contributed to and enhanced the laws against clerical marriage, laws that, if observed, would "monasticize" the priesthood. This fixed ideology of manliness left no place for the women and children of the secular clergy. Yet clerics found ways to circumvent these laws and to continue their customs well through the twelfth century.

Married Clergy and Manliness After the Conquest

In 1096, a party of Anglo-Norman bishops gathered to witness the consecration of two bishops-elect: Samson, to the diocese of Worcester, and Gerard, to the diocese of Hereford.² These two men represented the two vast spectrums of those who served the episcopacy. Samson, bishop-elect, was married with at least one son. Gerard was committed to the cause and enforcement of clerical celibacy. The other bishops present fell somewhere in between. Thomas I, archbishop of York, brother of Samson, and a priest's son, had a reputation

for chastity. Maurice, bishop of London, was not known for celibacy and supposedly was prescribed an "emission of humours" to remedy his ill health.³ Herbert Losinga, bishop of Norwich, had previously lived an unchaste life but changed for the better and became a model bishop. Gundulf of Rochester was a bishop known for his saintly life. At the head of this party was the archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm, whose reputation for holiness and reform was known throughout England and Normandy. At the turn of the eleventh century, these bishops represented the older traditions of the Anglo-Norman clergy and the newer one, based on an ascetic, celibate ideal of clerical life.

As the medieval Church was establishing its control over marriage, re-defining it as indissoluble and monogamous, Normans continued to operate under a cultural system that placed control over marriage in the hands of the parties involved. Marriage was dictated by local custom, not by a remote group of reforming clergy.⁴ There was nothing exceptional about the way that Normans associated marriage and procreation with masculine social status; other medieval cultures made similar connections. The Normans did, however, place great emphasis on the possession of functioning male genitalia. To achieve the social status of a male, one was required to have a functional male body. This is the reason Norman aristocrats frequently engaged in castrating their political enemies, even for nonsexual crimes.⁵ The ability to govern, over one's household or one's locale, was tied to an essentialist definition of masculinity.

Norman culture exalted fecundity as part of a system of "predatory kinship," a system that would seem to exclude vowed celibates, yet this network of power included ecclesiastics, both married and celibate. In 989, Duke Richard gave the archbishopric of Rouen to his son Robert, who served the see until 1037. Archbishop Robert had three sons with his partner Herleva. William the Bastard continued this tradition and appointed trusted kinsmen to all of the episcopal seats in Normandy. His brother Odo took the see of Bayeux in 1049; he, along with the (married) Hugh of Lisieux, William of Evreux, Ivo of Sées, and John of Avranches, were warriors "drafted into the family business as bishop."⁶ In the post-Conquest Church, it was largely the aristocratic elite who entered the elite ranks of bishops, deans, and archdeacons, along with the "new men," ambitious royal servants who received powerful positions.⁷ These men were appointed by the king/duke to high ecclesiastical positions and, in many cases, had already established marital households. While the Anglo-Norman Church could include celibate clerics in elite positions, married clerics were certainly not excluded.

The Normans did not transplant the institution of clerical marriage to England with the Conquest of 1066. Clearly, clerical marriage existed among the parish clergy in England before this time.⁸ The Normans solidified the creation and support of secular cathedral chapters, in which secular canons could hold individual prebends; that many canons were married and passed their prebends to their sons was characteristic of this “new kind of very secular cathedral chapter.”⁹ Such chapters had existed in Normandy from around the mid-eleventh century but only in England from about 1090. By legitimizing clerical marriage for the elite clergy, by instituting married bishops and allowing their sons to inherit elite ecclesiastical appointments, Normans promoted the idea that marriage and progeny spelled an increase in social and political power. Most of the kings/dukes were complicit in allowing married clerics into their administration and, thus, to public legitimacy; in spite of reformist legislation, clerical marriages persisted and were seen as socially acceptable unions. As long as married bishops, archdeacons, deans, and other church elites existed, parish clerics could assume they too were permitted wives.

This Norman tradition of clerical marriage was well noted by early chroniclers. Gilbert Crispin described the conditions of the Norman Church in the early eleventh century, when “priests and great bishops married freely and carried arms, just like laymen.”¹⁰ Bernard of Tiron’s hagiographer highlighted the same conditions, saying that “it was customary throughout Normandy for priests to take wives publicly, to celebrate weddings, and to sire sons and daughters to whom, when they died, they left their churches by hereditary right. When their daughters married, many times, if they had no other possessions, they gave the church as a dowry.” The writer lamented that the priests would swear never to forsake their wives, and, in doing so, “they bound themselves by oath never to stop being fornicators, never to approach the body and blood of Christ except as unworthy criminals.” As Bernard preached celibacy in this region, the clerics’ wives began to fear being cast astray by their husbands. In response, these women attempted to murder Bernard, apparently unsuccessfully. A married archdeacon was so persuaded by Bernard’s eloquent preaching on the subject of fighting carnal sin that he prevented the mob of priests and their wives from harming the preacher.¹¹ According to Orderic Vitalis, the custom of married clergy in Normandy went back to the time of Rollo in the tenth century. Priest were typically trained in warfare, but largely illiterate, and “held their lay fees by military service.” After the Council of Rheims in 1049, priests were forbidden to take wives or bear arms. Orderic cynically stated that “the priests were ready

enough to give up bearing arms but even now they are loath to part with their mistresses or to live chaste lives."¹²

After the conquest, the custom of clerical marriage was the single largest barrier to the reform of the secular clergy in the Anglo-Norman Church, and it was so for one very particular reason: the secular clergy did not see a conflict between marriage and service to the church. Clerics used marriage in the same manner as others in medieval society: as a medium through which legitimate heirs were created and by which land could be transmitted. In the case of second-generation Normans, the increase of landholdings through marriage was vital to their social status in a time of transition. Men who did not make successful marriages or did not produce legitimate heirs jeopardized the future of their natal family; families who did not expand their kinship network inevitably declined. The extension of a kinship network had always been a strategy of the aristocracy, but it was increasingly important for the "new men," who had little status in England before entering royal service. By gaining royal favor, and through it increased opportunities for land- and office-holding, the new men were able to increase their social status.¹³ To preserve that status and expand one's natal network, it was necessary to marry and produce legitimate sons who could inherit and extend the family's success. Many nobles married later in life, and some were much older when they had children; this created a system where very young heirs had to be fostered by other people, especially in cases where the father was no longer living.¹⁴ There is some indication that the secular clergy also followed such a pattern of late marriage. Writing in the late twelfth century, Gerald of Wales commented that "we have seen many priests remain spotlessly continent . . . up to the time of becoming a canon and even up to old age—priests who, when they should have completely renounced the world and wholly dedicated themselves to God, have, at the end of their lives, committed open sins of lust and begotten children."¹⁵

Just as marriage and the procreation of legitimate heirs were expected of those wanting to increase and maintain their family's wealth and social status, a problem arose for the elite clergy, who, under the "new laws," were unable to expand their family networks in the same manner. Many Anglo-Norman clerics had legitimate families before assuming clerical offices, and those who did not would have had every expectation that marriage and a family were permissible. If a cleric had already entered royal service and was functioning as a chaplain for the king, then, at some point during his service, he faced the reformist decrees on clerical marriage. Roger of Salisbury was one of these civil administrators

who served Henry I before he became king. In all likelihood, Roger's marriage to Matilda of Ramsbury came after his episcopal consecration in 1102; later that same year, he attended Anselm's first council and would have presumably heard the anti-marriage decrees.¹⁶ He, like many other clerics, had a reasonable expectation that clerical marriage was not only permitted but accepted by Anglo-Norman culture.

The Legislation Prohibiting Clerical Marriage in the Anglo-Norman Realm

Early eleventh-century efforts to prohibit clerical marriage in England and Normandy were sporadic and ineffective, largely due to the lack of centralized reform efforts. For most of the eleventh century, the Roman pontiffs led the way in designing legislation to achieve a celibate priesthood. The term "nicolaitans" was used to refer to clerics who kept wives, a reference derived from the biblical Nicolaitans, a group known for their sexual licentiousness.¹⁷ The impetus for the Roman campaign against clerical marriages appears to have been twofold: the preservation of a ritual purity and the prevention of priestly lineages; but, ultimately, it was a reconfiguration of the sacerdotal body, one that rendered it chaste but virile. Under Pope Leo IX, papal policy shifted toward prohibiting priests from living with their wives, which was defined as an act of fornication. In 1049, measures were taken to enforce celibacy by excommunication and by ordering the laity not to attend the masses of such priests.¹⁸ Leo later added that abandoned clerical concubines should be made into slaves (*ancillae*) of the Lateran palace.¹⁹ Shortly afterward, a Lisieux council (1055) took the first steps in Normandy to separate clerics from their wives; the decrees of this council forbade clerics in major orders from living at home with women, under penalty of excommunication.²⁰ Thus, the earliest Roman efforts at enforcing clerical celibacy were the literal, physical separation of men from their wives, presumably to project an image of the chaste body.

This sort of Roman legislation was further continued by Nicholas II, who reiterated Leo's decrees, and eventually by Gregory VII. Gregory repeated the previous canons concerning celibacy in 1074, when he convened his first synod and decreed that no one would be promoted to major orders without a vow of chastity.²¹ He also argued that those unchaste priests and deacons should be prohibited from performing their duties. In one of his letters, he asserted,

It has come to our ears that certain of your people are uncertain whether or not priests and deacons or others who minister at the sacred altars and who persist in fornication should do duty at mass. To them we reply by the authority of the holy fathers that in no wise should ministers at the sacred altar who continue in fornication do duty, but they should be driven outside the sanctuaries until they show fruits worthy of repentance.²²

Pope Urban II continued the reform efforts of his predecessors by extending the celibacy campaign to separate priests further from their wives. At the Council of Clermont in 1095, Urban decreed that priests, deacons, and subdeacons would be removed from office if they cohabitated with a woman.²³ This canon was reissued at the councils convened at Rouen, Tours, Nîmes, and Poitiers. Before the injunctions at Clermont, Urban, in the manner of Peter Damian, had stated at Melfi (1089) that clerical wives might be offered to noblemen as slaves, if they aided the pope with his reform.²⁴

While the Roman initiatives against clerical marriage gained strength under the reform papacy, efforts to achieve similar measures were enacted by the archbishops in England and Normandy. The experiences of archbishops like Lanfranc and Anselm in eradicating clerical marriage reveal the many problems with the institution of such laws. What these bishops pursued as reform policy was not strictly Roman, although it shared some of the same goals. In addition to the severe policies toward clerical marriage and clerical concubines, the papacy also passed decrees against lay investiture, decrees that were not promulgated at the earliest reform councils in Normandy.²⁵ Instead, the Anglo-Norman councils created laws on clerical marriage that fit into a wider initiative to define a standard of religious manliness.

Lanfranc's council at Winchester (1076) took a departure from the stricter, Roman rules on clerical marriage by allowing currently married priests to keep their wives, but prohibiting both secular canons and new ordinands from doing the same. Lanfranc's intent behind this decree was unclear but likely meant that married clerics should live with their wives chastely. When contrasted to the laws of 1072 promulgated by John d'Avranches at Rouen, these were lenient measures. John d'Avranches took a hardline approach worthy of the Roman initiatives by renewing the canons of Lisieux (1064). These decrees had said that priests, deacons, and canons who had taken wives and concubines since

1063 must put them aside; even clerics in minor orders were advised to remain unmarried, a clause unseen in any other legislation of this period.²⁶ John's position on this issue is interesting, given that his brother Hugh had been a married bishop of Bayeux. John's Rouen synod also stipulated that married clerics could not obtain any part of the revenue of their churches, even if a continent vicar served as a substitute, and that archdeacons should also model chastity for their clergy and not "smuggle" any women into their homes. These decrees went farther than previous synodal legislation, stipulating that those clerics who had "lapsed" publicly would not automatically be allowed to return to their churches, even after doing penance, for this would only encourage further incontinence. Only in extraordinary circumstances should an incontinent priest be allowed to return.²⁷

John's decrees were significant, not only for their severity but also because they gestured toward the model of the manly celibate. A public lapse revealed a disorderly, priestly body, one that showed failure to restrain sexual desire. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, John's renewal of the Lisieux canons and his extension of severe penalties were met with one of the most notorious riots in Norman history, in which the assembly of married priests reacted to the legislation by casting stones at the archbishop.²⁸ Lanfranc, as abbot of St. Stephen's of Caen, had presided with Archbishop Maurilius over a similar set of severe decrees at the earlier Council of Rouen. Lanfranc, then, was part of introducing hardline tactics against married priests in Normandy twelve years earlier; when presiding over the Winchester council as archbishop of Canterbury, he backtracked from his previous position. The reasons behind this move are entirely speculative. Lanfranc may have learned from previous experiences that such legislation was hardly enforceable and could result in short-staffed parish churches, or he may have been pressured by his suffragan bishops to take a more gradual approach to the problem.²⁹ This raises an important question. Were Norman priests easier to discipline and separate from their wives than English ones? Or was the policy at Rouen in 1064 such an abysmal failure that Lanfranc learned to take a different approach with incontinent clergy?

Lanfranc's experience as the new archbishop of Canterbury brought him into intimate contact with the problem of clerical marriage, as he encountered married bishops. In 1071, he wrote a letter to Pope Alexander II, seeking advice on how to treat the case of Bishop Leofwine of Lichfield, who publicly acknowledged his own wife and children. Leofwine was not the only married bishop, as Lanfranc discovered. In a second letter to Pope Gregory VII in 1073, Lanfranc

admitted that “bishops, the very men who should be shepherds of souls, in their endless craving for worldly glory and the delights of the flesh are not only choking all holiness and piety within themselves but the example of their conduct is luring their charges into every kind of sin.”³⁰ Lanfranc knew very well that the existence of married bishops reinforced a lay model of masculinity, making the problem of clerical marriage quite difficult to eradicate, as it modeled improper behavior to the lower clergy. If Lanfranc’s 1076 decrees had been effectively enforced, it would have created a two-tier system, with older clerics allowed to keep their wives but newer clerics displaced from this tradition; the effect would have been to encourage the perception that clerical marriage was allowed (for some).

Lanfranc was well aware of John d’Avranches’s efforts in Normandy to eradicate clerical marriage. In a letter to the archbishop of Rouen, Lanfranc openly acknowledged his admiration of John’s legislative efforts and dispelled any notions that he had criticized John for not controlling his clerics more effectively. Instead, he lauded John for his strong-handed efforts at ecclesiastical discipline and reiterated that he himself, as defined in the decrees of Winchester, would prohibit any new canons, priests, or deacons from marriages or else deprive them of their benefices.³¹ But Lanfranc’s understanding of implementing such strict policies is made evident from his advice to other bishops on the subject. In a letter to Herfast, bishop of Thetford, Lanfranc advocated a perhaps milder punishment for a cleric irregularly ordained a deacon and who also happened to be married. Lanfranc advised that, since the man was unwilling to put away his wife, he should be taken out of the deaconate and ordained to a minor order; if the cleric later decided to live chastely and commit to it permanently, then he could recover his deaconate.³² This was a quite reasonable solution for the time; the priesthood might bring a higher degree of manliness, but some were better off pursuing marriage like the laity. The importance of a chaste life was made evident once again when Lanfranc advised the archdeacons of Bayeux concerning the deposition of a priest who committed manslaughter. The archdeacons desired to know how long the priest had to wait to celebrate Mass, after having committed such a crime. Lanfranc’s response indicates what the archbishop saw as the paramount issue. He advised the archdeacons to examine the life of the priest and see if he was truly penitent; “above all whether he is determined to maintain physical chastity from now on and promises that he will maintain it until the end of his life.” While the circumstances of the case are not known, it appears that the priest may have been married or living with a woman. If the

priest lived continently, he would be able to celebrate Mass after the completion of his penance for the crime of manslaughter. Lanfranc warned, "but if not, it will be hazardous for you and disastrous for him if with unclean hands he dare to sanctify the body and blood of Christ."³³ This case shows the relative view of such infractions in the mind of Lanfranc. Manslaughter could be expiated through penance and continent living, but incontinence risked the reputation of the priesthood and threatened pollution of the sacrament.

Overall, Lanfranc's policy on clerical celibacy exhibits an understanding of the times and an ability to work with incontinent clerics while still maintaining loyalty to the campaign against clerical marriage. The decrees of Winchester had been largely ineffective, as the continued promulgation of celibacy canons suggest. Six years after Winchester and eight years after Rouen, a synod convoked at Lillebonne by William the Conqueror and Archbishop William Bona Anima of Rouen adopted measures that prohibited canons, deans, priests, deacons, and subdeacons from living with women and ordered that those accused of such would have to defend themselves in court. Those who failed to prove their innocence were deprived of their churches. The sentiment of Lillebonne was similar to earlier Norman synods, like that of Rouen (1072), but it departed sharply in its manner of penalty. It ordered incontinent clerics to clear themselves in the bishop's court, unless they were accused by a parishioner or layman; in such a case, the accused was ordered to prove his innocence in a mixed court of laymen and clergy. The penalty was harsh for those deemed guilty: lifetime forfeiture of church benefice. William the Conqueror spearheaded this hardline policy, making it clear at the synod that he was not trying to usurp the power of the bishops over their clergy, while at the same time assigning blame on the bishops for their failure on this matter. The king also stipulated that bishops and their agents could not extort any fines from unchaste priests.³⁴ Lillebonne, in encouraging the laity to take an active role in disciplining errant clerics, began the unseemly trend of lowering the masculine authority and status of the priest in his community. By allowing the parishioner to judge an unchaste priest, this measure reversed the roles of confessor and penitent. The reform ideal of elevating the spiritual status of the priest and sanctifying his role in the Mass collided with actions taken by the king and ecclesiastics at Lillebonne, who placed the laity in a position of authority, at least in cases involving incontinent clerics.

On the other side of the English Channel, Lanfranc's successor Anselm continued to battle clerical marriage, adopting even more severe measures. After Lanfranc's death, English cathedral chapters experienced a "heyday" of married

clerics, beginning around 1090.³⁵ Anselm's Council of Westminster (1102) reiterated that archdeacons, canons, priests, and deacons could not marry, and if currently married could not retain their wives. His measures marked a sharp departure from Lanfranc's leniency thirty years earlier. Subdeacons, a group not always included in previous legislation, also had to renounce their wives, if they had made a profession of chastity. Priests could not celebrate Mass as long as they were married, and parishioners were banned from attending services officiated by concubinous priests. In recognition of the growth of the office of archdeacon and its concomitant power, those who became archdeacons had to be ordained, at a minimum, to the rank of deacon (which required celibacy). The harsher aspects of these decrees lay in the ban on attendance at Masses celebrated by married priests.³⁶ By mandating that the laity boycott the church services of married priests, these laws once again provided the means of assault on the masculine honor of the clergy, an assault encouraged by distant reformers, whether from Rome or an Anglo-Norman council. The married priest was removed as a leader in his community, with respectable social status, and transformed into an object of derision, subject to ridicule and denigration at the hands of his parishioners. Yet it is not clear that the parishioners of these communities were opposed to the marriage of their village priest and would have ceased attending services. Daniel Bornstein's work on late medieval Cortona indicates that, even centuries after the prohibition on clerical marriage, rural priests were still living with women, and that this was publicly known in the community without censure; the community was strictly concerned that church services not be neglected.³⁷ Still, the most curious aspects of this council lie not in the canons promulgated but in those bishops present at this council. Of those prelates present, three already had, or would, marry and have clerical sons: Samson of Worcester, Robert Bloet of Lincoln, and Roger of Salisbury. The laws should have had some impact on these married bishops, even if they had married before their consecration. There is, however, no indication the laws adversely affected their personal or professional lives.

Anselm's actions in 1102 produced a flurry of letters addressed to him from his ecclesiastical colleagues on the subject, especially from bishops who had difficulty with the implementation of these policies. After the council, Herbert of Losinga, bishop of Norwich, experienced such problems in enforcing the statutes. The priests in his diocese were unwilling to give up their women, and this posed a problem since married/concubinous priests were not allowed to officiate at services. Anselm advised Herbert to find chaste priests who could serve

instead; if not, then the archbishop advised his suffragan that monks were to replace unchaste priests at the altar. Anselm also suggested that Herbert elicit the support of the laity in expelling such clerics from their churches; if these clerics were not willing to go, “let all the Christians act against them.” Referring to a specific case of clerical incontinence, Anselm went even farther with his directive, urging parishioners to expel both the fornicating priest and his wife from their community and to seize their land, “until they come to their senses.”³⁸

Implementing such severe decrees on married priests would have resulted in a shortage of priests, as the letter to Herbert of Losinga suggested. Without a priest, a community would not have had access to final absolution. This was such a pressing issue that Anselm sought advice from Pope Paschal II on the matter, asking, “is it permitted to receive absolution and the body of the Lord when in danger of death from priests who have women when no chaste priest is present? If this is permitted, and such priests refuse to administer to those in need because their masses are scorned, what is to be done?” Paschal’s reply was that viaticum from any cleric, even an unchaste one, was preferable to jeopardizing the soul. This series of letter exchanges suggests that some married priests rebelled because their masses were banned by the Church, and they were being publicly denounced by their own parishioners. Paschal’s comment was that, if these priests refused to provide the last sacrament to a dying parishioner, “they are to be punished most rigorously as murderers of souls.”³⁹

Married clerics found ways to keep their women, even claiming that it was legal to do so. Gerard, the archbishop of York, sought counsel from Anselm because those clerics closest to him, secular canons of his cathedral chapter, were devising loopholes to evade the statutes of Westminster. The canons argued to Gerard that “according to the council there will be no women in our houses. But no regulation of the Council prohibits us from meeting women alone and without witness in the houses of our neighbors.” Gerard complained that those canons who had been appointed priests and deacons had never renounced their wives and still publicly acknowledged them. These clerics seemed more interested in benefiting financially from their prebends than in benefiting spiritually from their duties at the altar. Other clerics resisted ordination because they did not want to take a vow of chastity.⁴⁰ Anselm’s response to Gerard’s letter did not discuss the problem of the canons’ loophole, but his letter to William, the archdeacon of Canterbury, did provide guidance on the subject. As in the case of York, clerics in William’s archdeaconate were also seeking a way around the legislation prohibiting clerical marriage. In particular, archdeacons and canons

moved their women out of their homes in the towns, but into their country manors.⁴¹ Anselm made a somewhat surprising decision, saying that “for the time being, until something else is laid down, this should be tolerated if they make a resolute promise not to have intercourse with them, nor to speak to them without legitimate witnesses.” For those priests who refused to abandon their wives, the canons of the council were to be observed, and these priests were not to celebrate Mass. Yet Anselm allowed that, if these priests could find chaste replacements, they could then keep their benefices until Lent.⁴²

The Westminster canons of 1102 were not upheld, and, with Anselm in exile, Henry I began collecting the *cullagium*, a tax on married clerics, as a revenue-raising tactic. William of Malmesbury records that the decrees of the council were immediately ignored and “the first to offend were those who had made the rules,” a statement likely referring to the bishops who presided over that council.⁴³ The collection of the *cullagium* by the king’s officials made it appear that the practice of clerical marriage was officially tolerated, especially in the absence of the reforming archbishop. In 1105, Anselm’s letter to Prior Ernulf about concubinous priests shows that many priests and even the king may have inherited an unclear understanding of the decrees of Winchester, which allowed then currently married priests to keep their wives. The king’s decree that “they could have both churches and wives as they had at the time of his father [the Conqueror] and Archbishop Lanfranc” was either a misunderstanding of the Winchester decrees or an intentional tactic to justly collect the *cullagium* from concubinous priests. Anselm declared boldly that such “execrable unions” had never been accepted by the Council of Winchester and that any priests living with women anywhere in England faced deprivation of their benefices.⁴⁴

After Anselm’s second exile had ended, he held a second Council of Westminster (1108), in which the effort to eradicate clerical marriage was renewed; in fact, the only records of this council suggest it was exclusively concerned with the problem of clerical marriage. Anselm’s biographer Eadmer, who documented the proceedings, explained that many priests in England had fallen back into their old marriages or even taken on new relationships during the time of the archbishop’s exile; this laxity explained the need for another directive, one that would attempt to prevent the “loopholes” of the previous council. The 1108 decrees were even more severe than the ones promulgated six years earlier. While the spirit of the decrees remained the same as the 1102 conciliar statutes, the change in administrative enforcement was most notable. Priests, deacons, and subdeacons could not cohabit with any women, except close rel-

atives as defined by the Nicene consanguinity canons. Priests had to put away their women, out of their homes and out of proximity to their homes. Priests and their women could not meet in any private home; if necessity required that they speak to their women, they had to do so “out of doors” in front of at least two witnesses. If priests violated this decree and were accused by two witnesses or by the “common talk of the parishioners,” they faced canonical compurgation. The guilty were to be deprived of their benefices. Those who insisted on cohabitating with women and celebrating Mass had 8 days to decide between the two; afterward, the unreformed would be excommunicated. As part of these decrees, controls were enacted to ensure that *cullagium* and other forms of extortion did not persist. Archdeacons and deans were singled out for their likely involvement in such extortion. Finally, the council declared that priests who abided by the law and put aside their women were to abstain from celebrating the divine office for forty days and have suitable vicars serve their churches. If they relapsed into their former habits, these clerics would have their property seized, along with their *concubines*, and both handed over to the bishop.⁴⁵

What is notable about Eadmer’s reporting of the 1108 council is that of the numerous, lengthy directives regarding clerical unions, not one uses the term *uxor* (wife) to describe the female partner of a priest. Eadmer’s choice to describe priests’ partners differently from his description of the 1102 council may have been intentional. In 1102, he describes these women as they must have appeared to all in Anglo-Norman society: legitimate wives. But by 1108 the necessity of further legislation to eradicate this problem led him to address them as the Church now viewed them—the “women” (*feminas or mulieres*) of priests.⁴⁶

The effectiveness of this second Council of Westminster is difficult to gauge. The administrative controls put into place to control clerical marriage were the most restrictive to date. Eadmer, however, writes that, after Anselm died, the old problems resurfaced. Priests and canons made deals with their *bishops* and their archdeacons to take back their wives or to take new ones.⁴⁷ In the duchy, similar problems of enforcement continued. In 1119, Pope Calixtus II called a council at Rheims at which decrees against hereditary benefices and clerical marriage were repeated; the legate John of Crema had drafted this legislation with the guidance of the pope, and the decree against clerical marriage specifically stated that “we utterly forbid priests, deacons, and subdeacons to cohabit with concubines (*concubinarum*) and wives (*uxorum*)” and stipulated removal from office as the penalty, along with excommunication.⁴⁸ The use of

both terms “concubines” and “wives” must have intended clarity, to eliminate confusion over what kind of sexual relationships with women was permissible. These decrees were comparatively mild to Anselm’s canons and did not include his detailed parameters of enforcement. The response to these decrees by the Norman clergy indicates not only a strong resistance but also a large degree of disbelief at the actions taken by the church. Archbishop Geoffrey of Rouen, after returning from the reform council at Rheims, “burned with enthusiasm to reform the priests of his diocese” with these mandates. He convoked a synod at Rouen to begin this process, and the audience of clergy responded with shock:

Among the canons of the council which he promulgated was one forbidding any cohabitation with women, and he hurled the dire threat of excommunication against offenders. As the priests regarded such heavy burden with abhorrence, and murmured among themselves complaining of the conflict between body and soul, the archbishop ordered one eloquent priest, Albert, who had begun to say something,—exactly what I do not know—to be seized and thrown forthwith into the prison dungeon.⁴⁹

What followed was a riot of unprecedented proportion, which involved not only the archbishop’s men and the clerics but also the local townsmen who were brought into the fray. The archbishop, enraged by his clergy’s reaction, left orders with his guards to attack the men in the synod. A group of older priests were attacked unjustly by the archbishop’s men and, managing to escape, went back to their villages “carrying back alarming reports to their parishioners and concubines, and showing the wounds and livid bruises on their bodies as proof of their words.”⁵⁰ Orderic’s account of the riot, the only one in existence, unveils the perspective of the Norman clergy as late as 1119 on the subject of clerical marriage. First, the synod of priests reacted with distress at the canons against clerical marriage because such laws would create an inner struggle of the soul. Their disbelief is harder to explain, considering that such decrees had been previously promulgated in the duchy as early as 1054 and in their most severe form by John d’Avranches in 1072. Such a reaction suggests either that the clergy were largely unaware of such legislation or, more likely, that such legislation was so rarely enforced the custom of clerical marriage continued uninterrupted. Their complaint that they would face a struggle between the flesh and the soul indicates that the Norman clergy did not see a conflict between the priesthood

and marriage; furthermore, they did not accept the masculine battle against the flesh, so often emphasized by monastic reformers, as the only path to manliness. Additionally, Orderic writes that “the archdeacons and canons and discreet citizens were distressed by the shocking assault and sympathized with the servants of God who had suffered so unprecedented a humiliation.”⁵¹ The widespread acceptance of clerical marriage might have been behind the shift in policy. At the 1128 Council of Rouen, over which the king presided, the decree on clerical marriage only specified priests and no other clerics. It seems that ecclesiastical reformers decided to focus on one group of clerics and introduce change in phases.⁵²

The disbelief expressed by Norman clergy in the 1119 incident is consistent with Henry of Huntingdon’s recollection of the Westminster council of 1102, when he stated that clerical marriage “had not been prohibited before” and he noted that, while reformers saw this measure as promoting the “greatest purity,” others believed that there was a serious risk to seek a “purity beyond their capacity”; such enforcement would force clerics to “fall into horrible uncleanness.”⁵³ Henry’s statement shows that at least some clerics believed the male body to be sexually vulnerable, and such vulnerability could lead to greater sexual sins, a perspective that mimics that of the 1119 Norman clergy. Henry’s hostility to the clerical marriage laws is apparent in his *Historia Anglorum*.⁵⁴ As the son of a clerical dynasty and a clerical father himself, Henry’s perspective is valuable for understanding the clerical mindset toward these laws. While Henry’s history neglects in its entirety the 1108 Westminster council, he does detail later efforts at eradicating clerical marriage. Henry wrote accounts of the 1125 and 1129 councils and may have been an eyewitness to these events. What is notable about Henry’s description of these councils is his use of terminology. Perhaps his most famous story describes how the papal legate John of Crema, known widely for his efforts against married priests, preached to an assembly of clergy in 1125 that “it was the greatest sin to rise from the side of a whore and go to make the body of Christ.” But, as Henry pointed out, “although on the very same day he had made the body of Christ, he was discovered after vespers with a whore.”⁵⁵ Henry does mention the 1127 legatine council, but only in passing and without any description of the canons, a characteristic omission of the writer that Nancy Partner has argued was a sign of contempt.⁵⁶ Henry’s disapproval is also made apparent in his description of the royal council of 1129; here the bishops of England gave the authority to discipline concubinous priests to the king, who promptly reissued the *cullagium* to those who wished

to keep their wives.⁵⁷ Present at this council were Roger of Salisbury, married priest, and Thurstan of York, son of a married priest and who also presided over one of the most uxorious cathedral clergy in all England.⁵⁸ Henry's accounts of these councils, written in 1123 and 1133, describe the partners of priests as honorable "wives," not the degraded "whores" of the reformers.⁵⁹

Again, in spite of all this legislation enacted against clerical marriage, it is important to consider the social context. Henry I may have participated in enacting legislation against such unions and levying a tax, but his acceptance of clerical marriage is made evident by his employment of numerous married priests and their sons. Roger, bishop of Coutances, was married and had a son who was the chaplain of Henry I.⁶⁰ Richard of Beaufour had served as Henry's chaplain before the king nominated him to the bishopric of Avranches; he had three sons, at least two who were born before his consecration.⁶¹ Ouen, son of the priest Anger and his wife Popelina, also served as chaplain under Henry I; he later became bishop of Évreux. These few examples make it clear that married clerics and their sons were appointed to elite clerical offices. It is also clear from the attitudes expressed by the secular clergy that Anglo-Norman culture accepted married clerics and their sons. Henry I's imposition of the *cullagium* was not a moral stand on the subject of clerical marriage but an opportunity for revenue raising. Celibacy legislation provided political actors with an important means by which to exert their own interests.

The Problem of Enforcement in the Late Twelfth Century

If Henry of Huntingdon could refer to the female companions of priests as "wives" as late as 1133, then at what point did the social environment change and clerical "wives" become clerical "concubines" in common parlance? The answer to this question is uncertain, but evidence from the late twelfth century shows that, while the reformers continued to act as if clerical unions were illegal, the secular clergy operated under an assumption of legality and legitimacy when it came to their unions. In certain contexts, these unions were still recognized socially as viable clerical unions, even in the face of definitive ecclesiastical legislation to the contrary. While it is doubtful that marriage among bishops had died out by the mid-twelfth century,⁶² it is certain reformers had still been unsuccessful in destroying clerical unions among the bulk of the secular clergy.

Clerical unions persisted among the lower clergy and the cathedral canons in many dioceses across England and Normandy, even in regions under the

leadership of reform bishops. The see of Hereford was occupied by reformers, yet clerical marriage persisted there in some form well into the thirteenth century, perhaps even later.⁶³ In this region, many married clerics had received papal dispensations and could not be removed from their benefices. By the 1170s, there were so many married clerics that the pope advised Bishop Robert Foliot to leave those clerics alone, and not attempt to remove them; instead, the bishop should focus on *preventing* concubinage and hereditary benefices.⁶⁴ Elsewhere, the archdeacon Gerald of Wales was waging his own battle against concubinage within the chapter of Mynyw. In his struggle to become bishop of St. David's, Gerald was approached by canons who offered their support of his candidacy if he turned a blind eye to their concubines. Gerald refused, and the canons stood behind the election of another candidate, an abbot who, according to the archdeacon, "was like to do everything according to their desire, indulging his native land and acquiescing in the practices whereby clergy succeeded to their fathers' benefices and had concubines dwelling with them in their houses." Gerald lamented that "they had no cause to fear that he would chide or correct them for their sins."⁶⁵

As long as the upper clergy continued to keep their wives, the lower clergy could not be reformed, for clerical marriage would continue to be perceived as legitimate. One reason clerical marriage and hereditary benefices persisted at least among the rural clergy was the combined ownership of land and church; that is, the village priest in some cases was both local curate and the lord of the village, or at the very least came from the local family in charge of the *eigenkirche*. The English parish of Eye, from around 1150 to 1254, was controlled exclusively by one family as a proprietary church.⁶⁶ Alternatively, an abbot of a local monastery might appoint a nephew or brother as vicar to the parish church, and this appointee might then create a hereditary benefice. In other areas, local abbeys were weak and could not exert influence over the parish church; thus, clerical custom was able to persist.

The see of Hereford was not unique, and a closer look at the diocese of Lisieux points to some commonalities that were probably also seen in other dioceses. Although under the governance of a reform bishop, the diocese of Lisieux had a number of married or concubinous clerics. By the late twelfth century, Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, continued to battle clerical marriage and concubinage in his diocese and others in territorial Normandy. Letters from this time period confirm the continued practice of clerical unions, fifty years or so after it was outlawed. The married priests of the late eleventh century

could profess innocence of the law, because such efforts had been sporadic and rarely enforced, at least effectively. A century later, clerics had knowledge of the anti-marriage mandates that would have been widely disseminated by their time. Thus, this practice was not from ignorance, especially in a diocese led by the reform-minded Arnulf. Rather, the continued practice of clerical unions resulted from wide social acceptance as clerics.

Arnulf's letters provide insight into how these clerics may have perceived their positions. In a letter to Pope Alexander III, Arnulf wrote that the priest of Vasouy, although he had served the bishop "for many years with devotion and humility," tried to remove his disciplinary case from the jurisdiction of the bishop to the jurisdiction of the abess of Montivilliers. This priest had been accused of concubinage and did not want to face the bishop's court over the matter. Arnulf excommunicated him for his refusal to proceed with the court, but the priest "nonetheless presumes to celebrate divine rites."⁶⁷ Arnulf first pointed out that the priest had a history of submission and obedience to the bishop, and no other problems with the priest's performance were noted. It was only when the priest was publicly accused of concubinage that he engaged in disobedience, attempting to remove his case to another jurisdiction, an action likely indicative of his guilt. Although he was formally accused, he continued to minister in his church even after excommunication. The priest's actions in this case indicate that he saw no conflict between his status as a "married" man and priest; rather than give up one or the other, he maintained his union and his office. If his parishioners refused to attend his services, it is not mentioned by the bishop.

In another letter to Alexander III, Arnulf had requested guidance for the problem of a monk who left during his novitiate to become a priest. This cleric, only known as "G" de Lachun, had entered a Cistercian monastery at some time prior but left and obtained multiple benefices. He had a son, on whom he bestowed one of these offices. He also married a woman while in the rank of subdeacon (*in ordine subdiaconatus matrimonium contraxisse*). The order of these events is unknown, but, in any case, marriage to a woman while a subdeacon or monk was still in violation of canon law. The pope's letter also suggests something else: that the cleric was able to contract a marriage in a Norman diocese as late as 1164. Had local communities been opposed to clerical marriage, no father would have married his daughter to a subdeacon, a union not only invalid but one that would be held in contempt by others. The pope's mandate was simple: the priest was to return to the monastery and to relinquish all benefices.

As for the clerical son, if he was born after his father left the monastery, he was to be removed from his benefice as well.⁶⁸ The pope's decision upheld the religious life as superior to the vocation of the priesthood. It was not simply that the priest had married and had a son; it was that he left the monastery for an inferior way of life.

Women were as likely as men to defend their unions as valid contracts. Hamon, a priest in Arnulf's diocese, had held a concubine for over thirty years, "kept her in his own house and table and bed" (*eadem domo et mensa et lecto . . . tenuisse*) and had children with her. This union between the priest and his concubine "has always existed, openly and known to all." The priest had also arranged marriages for his daughters. Although he was warned in the cathedral chapter to put aside this woman, he refused. When Arnulf sent two priests to the parish to warn him again and attempt discipline, "the mother and daughters assaulted and atrociously laid impious hands on the two priests [he] sent." The men were eventually able to escape, "as if from the teeth of she-wolves."⁶⁹

The priest's defense of his actions were based on a "certain ruling," which is not specified in Arnulf's letter. Arnulf read the pope's mandate at the chapter meeting, in front of his cathedral clergy, so that "it is good that the punishment of one may effect the discipline of many." Furthermore, it was important to the bishop that "it must not be said that the concubines have triumphed in an accusation so clearly against the honesty of the church." Last, Hamon's crimes extended beyond simple concubinage. Arnulf also requested that the pope reassign clerics to the churches in the diocese of Sées, which the priest Hamon had "caused . . . to be transferred to the son of his own priest," through another bishop.⁷⁰

The priests in these cases show the likely situation in the parishes of Normandy and, quite possibly, England. These men were faithfully ministering to the parishioners of their communities and clearly did not see a conflict between this vocation and their own marriages. While the ecumenical decrees of the Church had declared clerical marriage invalid, "custom" still declared these unions legal. They operated under the assumption of legality; these unions were not concealed from the public, and the clerics attended to their spiritual duties, even while under suspension and excommunication. The behavior of clerical wives and daughters shows that these women resented church interference in their family lives. The picture painted from these cases suggests that these clerics participated in unions, which to them was a traditional and rightful custom.

Arnulf's letters show that a network of protection existed to aid clerical

families. Some Norman priests colluded with each other to hide their wives and concubines from the view of the bishop. In some cases, local secular and ecclesiastical authorities were complicit in these arrangements, often in exchange for compensation. Parishioners, for the most part, do not seem to have objected much to concubinous priests; while accusations of clerical misconduct may have originated with parishioners, many were likely the result of interpersonal disputes with the cleric rather than an opposition to clerical marriage itself. A case from 1179 shows that even the nephew of Arnulf of Lisieux was involved in keeping a concubinous priest on staff. Hugh of Nonant had benefited greatly from his uncle's patronage, in the custom of their family tradition. Hugh, however, had failed to please his uncle and managed to turn many of Arnulf's clerics against him. In this particular case, Hugh had lent protection to a parish priest who had been found guilty of "concubinage, lewdness with the brothers' housekeeper, and perjury in the general synod." The priest had been removed from his parish church but continued to minister at the altar in spite of his excommunication, "with the presence and cooperation of the dean." Arnulf believed his nephew profited from this arrangement.⁷¹

Parish priests were not the only clerics who still persisted in their unions with women. Secular canons also continued to practice concubinage, even into the late twelfth century. On his election as bishop of Lisieux in 1141, Arnulf waged a war against the practice in his own cathedral chapter. Although the bishop never specified how he managed to convince his canons to turn out their women, he acknowledged it "required a hand of necessary severity." By his own words, Arnulf claimed, "I caused eighteen concubines to be abjured publicly by the canons." If this was true, then nearly 50 percent of cathedral canons had concubines when Arnulf became bishop in 1141.⁷² Arnulf's pride over this accomplishment is made evident by the way he praised himself in a letter to Pope Alexander III over the situation. Once his canons had reformed themselves, "its [his church] discipline became famous, so that many from all around were drawn to proper continence by our example. I used to exult that my church explained the form of continence to the rest. Holy shame prohibited them from returning as if to their own vomit."⁷³ Arnulf may have overestimated the effectiveness of his reforms, and his letter, so self-congratulatory, may well have been exaggerated.

The newer secular canons, however, did not abide by the reforms initiated by Arnulf. Since the older generation of Lisieux canons had achieved a reputation for chastity, the newer clerics were able to escape suspicion of concubinage. But,

as Arnulf explained in his letter to the pope, “as their numbers increased, their audacity increased.” Arnulf could not conclusively prove the clerics had concubines, for they defended each other and “the labor pains of birth were making the confidence of the new men stronger.” Arnulf’s tactic for reform initially consisted of “counsels of warning, and then threats, and something of punishment,” but he was unable to eradicate the practice. It was only when he turned to more severe measures that the chapter came together to oppose him and plot against him, under the leadership of his own nephew Sylvester.⁷⁴ Arnulf’s letter to the pope says outright that “no judge from Normandy is good for us, nor is there security in Normandy for trying [the case].” With this statement, he acknowledged that, even after extensive conciliar legislation against clerical marriage, the cultural system still accepted and perpetuated clerical unions and that a network of protection existed to support these unions.

In another case, Arnulf’s frustration was apparent over his inability to reform his clergy, due to this network of protection. He appointed a canon named Gervaise to handle a parish church in his diocese. Gervaise presented a vicar to hold the *cura animarum*, a cleric who, after serving the church for some time, took a wife and fathered children with her. The concubine was also the mother of a local youth, heir to the village estate. The priest publicly proclaimed his partnership with the woman after he had children with her, an indication he believed in the validity of the union and legitimacy of his children. Arnulf bitterly recounted that the priest “exulted as if he had carried her off by a legitimate marriage and scoffed at the other priests and concubines, because he had been adorned with a more noble concubine than the rest.” For some reason, this same priest feared his stepson, the soon-to-be lord of the village, and when the young man came of age, the priest ran away with a large amount of church property and was not heard from again for many years. When the lord of the village died suddenly, the priest “returned to the bed of his first filth and iniquity more boldly secure.” He returned to the church and tried to buy it back from Gervaise; by this time, another vicar had been appointed.⁷⁵

Arnulf’s appeal to the pope on this matter illustrates that his own canon Gervaise and possibly the archbishop of Rouen, Rotrou, were involved in protecting the outlaw priest. The priest later “broke into the church, dressed in stolen priestly vestments. He celebrated the whole office for the parish and profaned the holy altar with a sacrilegious usurpation.” Although Arnulf excommunicated the priest and forbade him to enter the church, the priest continued to officiate. Against Arnulf’s claims, the priest argued he had the permission of

the archbishop to continue serving his church.⁷⁶ This was actually the second time Arnulf specified that the archbishop Rotrou would be more favorable to the concubinous priest; in the case of the priest from Vasouy, mentioned above, Arnulf had said Rotrou “still is suspect and very favorable to the other side in this case.” Once again, this priest was able to continue his duties due to a network of protection, which may have even involved the archbishop of Rouen.⁷⁷

What these cases suggest is that, despite legislation invalidating clerical marriages, many priests still operated under the assumption of legality and legitimacy regarding their unions with women. While Arnulf of Lisieux and his predecessors used the language of reform (“concubinage,” “concubine”) in describing clerical relationships, the actions of clerics show they still understood their partners to be wives. Given the success of these relationships in the long term, it is likely that their communities did as well. The ideology of the manly celibate, with its focus on sexualized chastity and the disciplined male body, gave weight to the legislation that created increasingly heavy restrictions on clerical unions, until eventually such unions were legally dissolved. The entrenched custom of clerical marriage among the clergy in England and Normandy was little changed by the initial wave of decrees requiring celibacy. The antimarriage decrees brought another issue to the forefront of ecclesiastical reform: the problem of children born from these unions, particularly sons destined for clerical office. As the next chapter will show, clerical sons posed an obstacle for the manly celibate model as reminders of their fathers’ bodily impurity.

Chapter 3



The Marginality of Clerical Sons

The writer Orderic Vitalis tells us that, when the Norman monk Guitmond was proposed for the see of Rouen, his enemies “did everything in their power to prevent him from obtaining the see. They could find nothing to criticize in this good man, except that he was the son of a priest.”¹ When the archbishop of Rouen died, Guitmond was nominated as his successor. His enemies, both lay and clerical, would ensure that he was denied the seat. Orderic’s brief rendering of Guitmond’s saga tells us that, as early as 1079 when Guitmond’s candidacy was proposed, being the son of a priest was a liability when it came to obtaining elite positions within the Anglo-Norman Church. Guitmond’s humility and monastic discipline were noteworthy, and he was highly regarded by his monastic contemporaries. He was later successful at acquiring the episcopal seat of Aversa, and when William Bona Anima was subsequently elected to the see of Rouen, he was subjected to the same criticism. Bona Anima, son of a former bishop of Sées, ultimately prevailed and assumed the highest seat in the duchy.

Orderic Vitalis knew something about the condition of clerical sons. He was, after all, the son of the priest Odelerius. At five years of age, Orderic was sent to train with the priest Siward, the vicar of a church held by his father. After studying with Siward for five years, Orderic joined the Norman monastery of St. Evroul, took monastic vows, and eventually became a priest himself.² From the earliest days of the Norman duchy, clerical sons entered church service and were publicly acknowledged sons of bishops, archdeacons, and priests.³ During the era of reform, sons of priests could still obtain elite clerical offices, but monastic reformers had, through their various legislative initiatives, already

created an atmosphere of suspicion over the legitimacy of these men, which made clerical sons vulnerable in their ecclesiastical careers.⁴

From a legal perspective, the bodies of clerical sons were essentially unmarked by anything they did; they were wholly defined by the actions of their priestly fathers, men whose broken vows of chastity were evident by the existence of their sons. Sexual behavior marked the fathers as effeminate men in the eyes of celibate reformers: softened men who were sexually dominated by women. Clerical sons, by their existence, offered proof of their fathers' gender identity, but their own status was more precarious, a liminal state in which they had cultural legitimacy at the same time as legal bastardization. Certain communities in England and Normandy even accepted and supported the education and training of clerical sons. The war over clerical marriage, however, ultimately had dire legal consequences for clerical sons: they were targeted by laws that sought to prevent them from an ecclesiastical career.

The Ecclesiastical Careers of Clerical Sons in England and Normandy

Norman society did not see the priestly life and biological fatherhood as incompatible. Procreative power was vital to the social status of Norman men. A man's virility was concretely proved by the existence of sons. Sons were highly desired over daughters in medieval society, but, even more, a man's ability to produce male children demonstrated that his semen was strong.⁵ Such desires were a cultural norm, built into a gender system that favored marriage and the sexual domination of women. For Norman society, the ability to produce heirs meant the ability to create a defined kinship network, on which loyalty and service could be built. As Eleanor Searle writes, "Normans trusted kinsmen, and built power only upon kinsmen, biological or artificial as might be."⁶

The ways that sons of Anglo-Norman clerics entered Holy Orders and assumed ecclesiastical careers paralleled the experience of laity whose own sons trained in their professions. This was especially true for the medieval elite, who planned their children's careers and future for very practical reasons. Parents could die prematurely or suddenly, and their children could be left with a very uncertain future. Children were frequently committed to ecclesiastical careers early in life. Child oblation was common until the twelfth century when such practices began to die out, at least for male children; it then became customary for aristocratic boys to receive benefices and prebends, with the expectation that they would one day assume ecclesiastical careers.⁷ This practice not only

guaranteed them a future source of income but gave them a “foot in the door” to a church career. While some may have elected not to become clerics, control of the benefice still provided an important source of revenue for the boy’s family. Normandy had a high percentage of lay patronage for churches, quite possibly the highest in continental Europe.⁸ Families maintained control of parish churches, even if their sons did not assume the rectorship of those churches. Since ordination to the first of the major orders, subdeacon, could not occur until the minimum age of twenty, a boy might not become a cleric, especially if through various circumstances it was no longer in the best interest of the family.

Because male children’s futures could be unsure, they generally received the same sort of education without regard to a specific career path. Nicholas Orme has found that sons of the Anglo-Norman elite received a generalized education from childhood to adolescence.⁹ It may be precisely this sort of education, undertaken in a secular environment, that explains the different expectations of clerics during this time. Children who spent their formative years in a cultural and familial environment radically different from the cloister likely grew into adult men whose notions of masculine identity were grounded in secular society. In short, many men who assumed an ecclesiastical position may not have been socialized to the religious life. Additionally, such men may have viewed a church career as an administrative position more than a religious vocation.

How were clerical sons of the parish clergy trained for their ecclesiastical careers? Men of the lower clergy would still have had access to cathedral schools, if they lived in proximity to an urban center. Clerics of rural churches, however, did not have the same advantage. The composition of the parish clergy in Anglo-Norman society was a mixture of lower aristocracy and peasantry. The wealthiest parish churches were likely controlled by the aristocracy who appointed family members to the benefices, while the poorest ones were served by men of lower social origins. Patricia Cullum has examined the clergy of late medieval England and found that most clerics attended song school or cathedral school as preparation for clerical careers; boys were also sent to train in clerical households. Both systems of clerical education, according to Cullum, “could have inculcated a particular social and even gender identity.”¹⁰ While this dynamic is apparent for clerics who lived in proximity to urban centers where cathedral schools and the like could be found, it is less apparent for rural parish clerics. In fact, it appears that rural priests had fewer opportunities for formal education in such schools and that their training came from local priests, sometimes their own fathers, with whom they “apprenticed.”¹¹

Fostering and sponsorship were one particular form of clerical education. The tradition of sending male children away from home goes back to the early Middle Ages, and the practice garnered strength under the Norman system of wardship. Under this system, orphaned children of the aristocracy were raised by their father's feudal lord until majority age.¹² This practice of fostering suited clerical sons who needed both position and training, and who were sent to live and work with other clerics—the various archdeacons, bishops, deans, and other clerical dignitaries of the Norman and English dioceses. These elite clerics had the status and ability to promote the careers of young aristocrats, whether or not they went on to become clerics.¹³ It was frequently most practical for young men to be sent for clerical training with their uncles, and this seems to have been the practice for many regions of medieval Europe.¹⁴ In some cases, among both the elite and lower clergy, it may have been customary for a father to train his own son. Gerald of Wales lamented that “wretched priests damnably involve themselves in begetting children and educating them (their own or, rather, a stranger’s) at a time when, near the end of their lives, they should attend to the salvation of their souls.” The clergy were involved in some form with the education of clerical children, and reformers were concerned that such care would cost local churches. The priest, “for the expensive cost of keeping his boys—for their education and preferments” might drain the resources of his church.¹⁵

Even celibate clerics could participate in their kinship network by the education and sponsorship of nephews. Clearly, during the age of reform, the Church was more comfortable with uncles assisting their nephews in obtaining important church positions than with a father passing on a benefice to his son. One of the best examples of such spiritual fatherhood was Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux (1141–1181). Although little is known about Arnulf's life before he became bishop, he did follow in the footsteps of his uncle and older brother, both of whom became important Norman clerics (and both named John). Uncle John became bishop of Lisieux (1107–1140) after serving as archdeacon of Sées, a post also held by both his nephews, John and Arnulf. Arnulf succeeded his uncle as bishop of Lisieux, and his brother eventually became bishop of Sées.¹⁶ In turn, Arnulf served as a mentor to two nephews, Sylvester and Hugh of Nonant, the former of which served as archdeacon of Sées, the latter as treasurer of the same chapter.¹⁷ Both were educated at Canterbury, and had ties to Thomas Becket.¹⁸ Arnulf's letters illustrate that he bestowed “many gifts” on his nephew Sylvester, who later encouraged a rebellion against

his uncle.¹⁹ His other nephew Hugh also disappointed him. In a letter to King Henry II, Arnulf wrote that he “brought up the little boy born from my sister very indulgently. I diligently caused him to be educated. I increased his incomes, and he answered me that more of everything should be conferred upon him.” Arnulf bestowed on Hugh the revenues of five churches in his diocese, but his generosity did not prevent his nephew from later betraying him.²⁰

Another option existed for those who wished to send their sons away to school for study under a *magister*. Normandy had schools whose cultural environments received and supported clerical sons. A school of this sort existed in Caen and was probably to some degree controlled by the monks of St. Stephen’s abbey; it likely emerged with the abbacy of Lanfranc around 1063 but had disappeared by about 1100.²¹ The school of Caen may have had an influence on the gender identity of the Norman clerics who studied in this area of Normandy, by way of its notable *magistri*. These masters, such as Lanfranc, accepted both monastic and nonmonastic students. David Spear has suggested that a primary reason for the disappearance of the Caen school was its inclusion of teachers who were supportive of the rights of priests’ sons and, in some manner, clerical marriage. Some of the masters had sons or were sons of priests themselves. These teachers also happened to be highly critical of the entry of monks into pastoral life.²² William Bona Anima, a *magister*, was the son of Radbod, bishop of Sées. Another teacher, Arnulf of Rohes, a friend of Odo of Bayeux, was the son of a priest from Flanders. The evidence on Thibaud d’Étampes, who taught at Caen in the 1070s, is not conclusive, but scholars have argued that he was the son of a priest, based on his extensive defense of such men.²³ Another clerical teacher, Gerald *scholarius*, is harder to trace, but is present in the documents, as is Alfred *scholasticus*. Gerald may have had two sons, and there is some indication that Alfred also had a son. All these men served as teachers in Caen between 1063 and 1100. After the beginning of the twelfth century, no new teachers appear in the historical record, and it seems that the Normans sought educational training elsewhere.²⁴ It would be problematic to assert a connection between the education received in such schools and the resulting gender identity of its clerics. The demise of the Caen school may have been its particular ideological direction, which did not discriminate against married clerics or clerical sons, but may have also been related to the antimonastic rhetoric of some of its teachers.

The school of Caen was not the only environment supportive of clerical sons. Certain cathedral chapters in Normandy and England created receptive

environments for training and employing them. Cathedral chapters in Normandy were served largely by secular canons, who obtained their positions through family networks. Just as archdeacons functioned as administrators in their localities, deans of cathedral chapters acted as administrative heads of the canons. The vast majority of archdeacons and deans in Norman cathedral chapters were related to canons and dignitaries in the same chapter, frequently as uncles and nephews or fathers and sons. Many Anglo-Norman bishops, archdeacons, canons, and other dignitaries were married, had sons, and presented those sons for institution to benefices. This sort of nepotism was normalized for the Norman church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Sons of clerics commonly entered the same cathedral chapters as their fathers and often assumed the same ecclesiastical positions.

The cathedral chapter of Bayeux in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was rife with family networks in general. Bayeux was known to be one of the richest dioceses in territorial Normandy, and its wealth was intrinsically tied to its number of clergy. As of 1092, the cathedral chapter employed thirty-nine personnel, quite possibly the largest number of cathedral clerics in the archdiocese.²⁵ The witness lists from charters dated 1092 to 1177 indicate that clerical fathers served alongside their sons and nephews. In a 1092 document, canon Ralph de St. Patrick and his son John appear on the witness list, as do canon Anschetil de St. Vigor and his nephew Ralph. Ranulf and Osbert, both sons of canon Thurstan, appear on the same charter; C. N. L. Brooke believes this Ranulf is the same Ranulf Flambard, future bishop of Durham, and his brother.²⁶ Magister Humphrey Bove, an archchaplain and chancellor of Bayeux, appears on the witness list of four charters from the later twelfth century. His nephew Gislebert was also a canon at Bayeux in the 1150s, as was his son Humphrey the Younger (*junior*), who appears in a 1177 charter.²⁷ Hugh Bove, a relative, was a Bayeux canon in the late 1170s, and an archdeacon from 1192 to 1200; he had also served as a canon at Salisbury in the 1160s. He held a prebend to the church of Britford in England, which he claimed he inherited from his father. His brothers Alexander and Roger were also clerics, the latter a canon and chancellor at the Bayeux chapter.²⁸ The dean of Bayeux, William of Tournebu, had two sons and two nephews serving the same chapter.²⁹

The Bayeux chapter was notable not only for its numerous father-son dyads but also for its large number of successful clerical sons who went on to prominent positions in the Anglo-Norman Church. Many of these promotions were likely due to the patronage of Bishop Odo. Three archbishops of

York, Thomas I (1070–1100), his nephew Thomas II (1109–1114), and the pious Thurstan (1114–1140) all spent time in Bayeux; Samson, the future bishop of Worcester, also was associated with Bayeux, as was the infamous Ranulf Flambard, who became bishop of Durham. The presence of these men at Bayeux and their later success in the upper echelons of the Anglo-Norman Church lend credence to the idea that Bayeux promoted and supported clerical sons and married clerics. In the Bayeux-Caen region, there appears to have been the same cultural expectation for clerics as for men of other social occupations—that sons would enter the same professions as their fathers. While information is lacking on other regions of Normandy, it is probable that this same expectation existed. Bayeux-Caen had strong cross-channel connections to York, and a number of clerics from the area went to England for ecclesiastical appointments; this was in parallel to the Bec-Canterbury connection, which seems to have favored notable monastics. Thurstan, future archbishop of York, was originally from Bayeux and may have interacted with an older Thibaud d'Étampes before assuming his ecclesiastical appointments in England. His father, Anger, had been a parish priest at Condé-sur-Seulles, a village outside Bayeux, which was controlled by the monks of St. Stephen's abbey. At some point, the family moved to England, where Anger assumed a prebend at St. Paul's cathedral in London. His prebend was "inherited" by his other son Ouen, who later followed in his father's footsteps as royal chaplain, before eventually becoming bishop of Evreux (1113–1139).³⁰ Thurstan also acquired a prebend at St. Paul's. Thurstan and Ouen went on to become exemplary prelates, without any *known* wives, concubines, or sons. Their nephew, Osbert of Bayeux, became archdeacon of Richmond, but was deposed after a scandal implicated him in the murder of William of York. Although Osbert was laicized, he sought to acquire a prebend for his own son.³¹

Although Thurstan and Ouen were sons of married priests, they lived chaste lives, at least as far as the historical evidence shows. While both became bishops after Anselm's reform canons against clerical marriage, they did so before Lateran I. Some clerical sons were truly drawn to a life of chastity. Thurstan had a deep respect for the Cluniac life, having visited Cluny early in his life; he may have been influenced by the austere piety practiced under abbot Hugh; he later joined the Cluniac community of Pontefract after his retirement. The chronicle of Hexham suggests that Thurstan preferred the ascetic life and held his rank of archbishop in contempt.³² A similar sentiment was expressed by the archbishop himself in a letter to Bernard of Clairvaux, in which he makes clear

his desire for the contemplative life.³³ Ouen also retired to a monastic community, the Austin priory of Merton. Both clerics lived the spiritual life as bishops and as the sons of a married priest. Neither espoused the masculine identity of the older generation of Norman clerics, like their own father, who had marriages and benefices. They instead embraced aspects of the religious manliness pursued by monastic reformers, ruling over cathedral chapters where married clerics and their sons held appointments. From Gerard, Thurstan's predecessor at York, we know married clerics and their sons populated the York chapter. Yet there is no evidence that Thurstan, for all his ascetic proclivities, tried to eradicate clerical marriage or remove sons of priests from positions in the chapter. Thurstan and Ouen may well have envisioned an atmosphere where celibate and married clerics could coexist, without stigmatizing clerical sons.

Bayeux was not unique among Norman chapters for employing clerical fathers and their sons. At Lisieux, the archdeacon Richard of Angerville (c. 1077–1099) had a son William who was a canon there sometime in the 1140s. Arnulf, son of the priest Serlo, is noted as a priest himself in a charter of the bishop around 1161.³⁴ At Coutances, canons Gislebert and his brother William are listed as sons of canon Tesceline (1150s+). The dean of Coutances, Peter the Chamberlain (c.1048–1093), was the father of canon John, and likely his brother Richard, the archdeacon of the same chapter.³⁵ One twelfth-century bishop of Coutances, Roger (c. 1112–1123), was married and had a son, William, who served as chaplain to the king.³⁶ In the diocese of Evreux, Fulk of Guernanville, a notable dean, was married and had eight sons, at least two of whom entered clerical life. At the same chapter, Robert the archdeacon (c. 1079–1113) had a wife and a son, Gislebert.³⁷ Even the diocese of Rouen was not immune to the presence of clerical fathers and sons. The archdeacon Benedict (c. 1055–1113) was the father of the canon John and the treasurer Nicholas. Gilbert the chanter (c. 1118) had five sons, and it appears they all entered service as treasurer of that chapter.³⁸

The English cathedral chapters, like their Norman counterparts, also contained many father-son clerical dynasties.³⁹ The cathedral chapter of St. Paul's in London had so many father-son pairs in the eleventh and twelfth centuries that the vast majority of canons came from clerical parentage, ahead of the aristocracy and burgher classes, and the majority of them came from Norman families. This was particularly true during the episcopacy of Maurice and Richard de Belmeis I.⁴⁰ Quintilian held a prebend from around 1102 to 1115, which his son Cyprian inherited in 1115. Albertus Lotaringus passed his prebend to

his son Hugh, as did Osbern de Auco, whose son Robert inherited his position around 1111. William, son of Ralph, held his father's prebend of Rugmere.⁴¹ Other evidence indicates that brothers and nephews also shared and inherited prebends through family connections. William of Calne is identified as *nepos* of Everard of Calne, while his successor Henry was the son of bishop Robert de Sigillo of London (1141–1150). William of Belmeis II held a prebend, probably bestowed on him by his uncle, Richard Belmeis II, of London. The notorious bishop of Durham, Ranulf Flambard, had served previously as chaplain to Maurice, bishop of London (1085/6–1107); his two sons Elias and Ralph were appointed to the same prebend at St. Paul's at different times. Nicholas Crocemannus passed his prebend to his son Nicholas; his daughter had two sons, both of whom assumed prebends in the St. Paul's chapter.⁴²

Outside the cathedral chapters, clerical sons secured ecclesiastical benefices with their fathers' support in parish churches, illustrating that this practice was not confined to elite positions. Richard of Beaufour, bishop of Avranches (consecrated 1135) had three sons: Alan, Richard, and Robert. Richard was likely related to Hugh (bishop of Bayeux), John (bishop of Avranches), and William of Beaufour (bishop of Norwich).⁴³ Before ascending to the episcopal see of Avranches, he had served as archdeacon of Norwich and controlled the church of Brantham (Suffolk). Once he was elevated to the bishopric of Avranches, his son Alan "inherited" the church of Brantham and collected the revenues as if he were the parson, much to the dismay of Battle Abbey's monks. In another of the dower churches controlled by Battle Abbey, the priest Witgar made an agreement with the abbot that, by instituting the priest's son to the church of Mendlesham, the priest would compensate the abbot four times the usual tithes. When Alan of Beaufour discovered this arrangement, he intervened, claiming that Mendlesham was his church "by right" and no increase in payments could be made without his approval.⁴⁴ Supposedly, Richard's sons were born before he became bishop.⁴⁵ This factor, however, did not prevent Richard from allowing Alan to control a number of churches he himself had previously controlled; this would technically have been illegal after the legislation of Anselm. The monastic chronicler never mentions that Bishop Richard intervened in the matter, and he may not have. Alan did, by proprietary right, usurp the revenues of the churches in the same manner as his father. What is also interesting is that the priest Witgar was able to arrange a deal with the abbot, who permitted a son to inherit his father's church.

Since canonries did not require the *cura animarum* (cure of souls), clerics

could hold them in plural and also hold a parish benefice. This system offered enormous financial and social rewards to both clerical fathers and their clerical sons. A father who could place more than one son in a church position might elevate his family's status, especially if the sons became influential churchmen. We know little of the origins of Osbert the priest and his wife Muriel, but their two sons established one of the most successful ecclesiastical dynasties for this era. Their sons Thomas and Samson were both employed by Bishop Odo of Bayeux, who took charge of their education.⁴⁶ Thomas served as treasurer of the Bayeux chapter and then was elevated to the archbishopric of York (1070–1100). As with the case of Guitmond and William Bona Anima, Thomas was initially declared unsuitable for the episcopal see because he was the son of a priest. Thomas, however, proved his birth had no bearing on his ability to serve his archdiocese. After his consecration by Archbishop Lanfranc, Thomas went on to live as a chaste bishop.⁴⁷

His brother Samson, however, did not aspire to the chaste life. Samson inherited his brother's position as Bayeux treasurer, served as archdeacon, and later was elevated to the bishopric of Worcester (1096–1112), as the successor of the ever saintly Wulfstan. King William had offered Samson, his chaplain, the see of LeMans, which Samson had refused, claiming, "but I am a man who has been guilty of sin all my life, and am stained in the sight of God with every kind of vice of the flesh and spirit."⁴⁸ William of Malmesbury concurred. He described Samson as "a man of the old school," undoubtedly a reference to his married state and his paternity; he lived a particularly gluttonous lifestyle and likely died from obesity.⁴⁹ Although he had served the king as chaplain, Samson, on his election to Worcester, had not held the prerequisite orders, and thus could not yet be ordained a priest. Samson was also married and had two sons who were appointed church positions themselves. If Eadmer's *Historia Novorum* is true, then Samson was a husband and father before his ordination to the priesthood and likely before his ordination to deacon.⁵⁰ Samson's paternity illustrates the unusual position of clerics who had children (and marriages) before ordination to the priesthood and before laws against the ordination of clerical sons. Samson's position as father was not a secret, and one reference in Eadmer's account indicates that clerics, even in elite positions like that of Samson, were known publicly to have children. On hearing of his son Thomas's refusal to profess obedience to Canterbury as archbishop of York (1109–1114), Samson replied that the "archbishop of York has been long since recognized by me as my son born of my wife (*ex conjugis filium*) and so according to the world

and human nature I am very properly in duty bound to promote his advancement and dignity.”⁵¹ Such a statement captures the perspective of possibly any clerical father during this time of transition.⁵²

The family of Henry of Huntingdon provides a glimpse at how, over time, clerical sons adapted to transitioning norms. Henry’s father was Nicholas of Little Stukeley, a cleric descendent from a Pays de Caux family (the Glanvilles). Nicholas had been appointed archdeacon of Huntingdon and canon by bishop Remigius of Lincoln around 1075. After Nicholas’s death in 1110, Henry was appointed to his father’s archdeaconry by Bishop Robert Bloet in whose household he had trained, after his education at Lincoln’s cathedral school. Like his father and Robert Bloet, Henry married and had a son of his own, Adam, who became a cleric. By the time Henry died, sometime in the mid-twelfth century, the office of archdeacon was largely protected against hereditary transmission; thus Adam did not inherit his father’s position as archdeacon, although he and his descendants continued in the clerical profession. One of Adam’s sons, Master Aristotle, was also a cleric, as was his own son Nicholas. Nicholas of Stukeley appears to be the last in the long line of clerical sons from Little Stukeley.⁵³ Henry’s case illustrates one probability for the fate of clerical sons as their status changed legally and then socially. Clerical sons may have, over time, descended from elite positions (canon, archdeacon, bishop) to the lower clergy, where local parish culture still supported the traditional masculine model for clerics.

Just as the sons of the clerical elite entered the upper echelons of church administration, the sons of the lower clergy also inherited ecclesiastical positions. Unfortunately, information on the lower clergy and their clerical sons is less conclusive and detailed than that of the elite clergy. Many of the cathedral canons discussed above also controlled church benefices that were passed down to them from their fathers, as in the case of Hugh Bove and the church of Britford. While there is ample evidence to suggest that sons of the lower clergy inherited their fathers’ benefices, the exact details and dynamics are not known for the majority of cases. What we do know comes from the legislation against clerical sons, legislation that marginalized them on the basis of their fathers’ misdeeds.

Movement Against Clerical Sons

The bodies of clerical sons were socially construed as legitimate and masculine, at least from the cases just explored. But proponents of sacerdotal celibacy saw clerical sons as signifiers of their fathers' connection to secular manliness. While the decrees passed against clerical marriage tended to show some uniformity and agreement, the legislation against clerical sons was mixed and inconsistent. At any one time, reformers had two goals in mind regarding clerical sons: to prevent their ordination to the priesthood in its entirety by declaring their birth status illegitimate and to prevent sons from inheriting their fathers' benefices. Both measures were intended to keep clerical sons out of the priesthood, thereby breaking the practice of hereditary sacerdotal dynasties. One of the most common tactics of reformers across Europe was the creation of laws that made clerical parentage an impediment to Holy Orders.

Scholars have suggested that such legislation against clerical sons presented these men as polluting, disorderly, and scandalous signs of their fathers' inability to maintain sexual self-control.⁵⁴ Any one of these interpretations may be accurate, but none of them acknowledges the conflicts and difficulties in enforcing such laws. It is true that ecclesiastical legislation focused on the sexual crimes of the clerical father and that decrees against clerical sons were measures intended to restrict the father's behavior. If the basis of these laws had been strictly concern over pollution (the son as an impure reminder), then it is unlikely that clerical sons would have been permitted to enter monastic orders, as monks and canons regular, both groups that operated in sacred space. Scandal was most certainly a concern, especially in the later Middle Ages, when clerical marriage legally did not exist and had not existed for hundreds of years. But the earliest creation and enforcement of laws against clerical sons was an effort by reformers to break apart the cultural model of manliness that allowed Anglo-Norman clerics to install their sons in their own benefices and canonries. As Ruth Karras has argued, "fatherhood was a powerful marker of masculine prestige in medieval society."⁵⁵ To accomplish their goal of a celibate priesthood, reformers had to stop the cycle of hereditary benefices, which would continue to perpetuate not only the inheritance of churches but also the idea that priests, fathers and their sons, could practice a gender identity like laymen in medieval society. Put simply, clerical sons were visible reminders that their fathers had failed to maintain the new standard of religious manliness.

These laws reflected the reality that all over Europe the sons of priests and other clerics either inherited their fathers' benefices or were ordained and ap-

pointed to other churches. Such a practice was not limited to the Anglo-Norman realm; in fact, the earliest legislation concerning the ordination of priests' sons originated in the sixth and seventh centuries from outside the duchy and kingdom.⁵⁶ Most of the decrees are found in *capitula* that also discusses clerical marriage and concubinage. Undoubtedly, the problem of priests' sons was tied closely to the problem of clerical celibacy, and reformers tried to solve the latter by way of the former. Despite this early presence of laws directed against priests' sons, there were still very few canons directed against clerical children during the reform movement of the eleventh and twelfth centuries; the decrees that did target clerical children, however, were reproduced in the major canonical collections and achieved widespread dissemination. In sum, these laws of the reform period prevented priests' sons from achieving Holy Orders, with the exception of those in religious orders, such as monks and canons regular. The exception is very telling. Bernhard Schimmelpfennig has argued that, while the intent of such laws is unclear, the priest's son who became a monk could expiate the sins of his father.⁵⁷ There is a more likely explanation. Since a priest's son could only achieve ordination to the priesthood in the context of a monastic environment, he was unable to create a hereditary benefice. This eliminated a medieval father's most masculine prerogative: the transmission of wealth to his kin.

The earliest of the twelfth-century laws restricting ordination of clerical sons originated in southern France, at the Council of Bourges in 1031. Canon 8 of this synod stated that "the sons of priests, deacons, and subdeacons, if they are born during the priesthood, deaconry or subdeaconry should no longer be permitted to be admitted into the clergy." Its purpose was to prevent those of illegitimate birth from entering Holy Orders. If these illegitimate sons were already clerics, they could remain but not be promoted to higher orders. What the statute does not specify, or perhaps even recognize, is that it allowed clerical sons into Holy Orders if they were born *before* the ordination of their fathers. Other canons of this synod ordered that the children of the clergy would not be permitted to marry. These canons suggest that illegitimacy, and the taint of impurity, was a factor in the denial of ordination.⁵⁸

The Bourges statutes were quite severe, even by eleventh-century reform standards; however, they are the only such statutes that offered exceptions to some clerical sons based on time of birth (before ordination or after it). Later papal and conciliar legislation did not offer any distinction on time of birth, thereby barring all clerical sons from major orders. Statutes from Poitiers

(1078), Melfi (1089), and Clermont (1095) all prohibited ordination of those “*ex fornicatione nati*” (born from fornication). Pope Urban’s formulations at Melfi specified that priests’ sons must be removed from the altar unless they were in monastic orders; this decree passed nearly verbatim into the canons of Lateran II (1139) and, from there, to the body of twelfth-century canon law. The sons of deacons and subdeacons, those other clerics beholden to celibacy, were not included in this statute. Although Urban’s Clermont council, six years later, expanded the ban on clerical sons to include all those born of fathers ordained to major orders (priests, deacons, and subdeacons), the most common language only specified priests’ sons.⁵⁹ One important component of these statutes that scholars have vastly overlooked is that these canons, unlike the Bourges statutes, never distinguished the time of birth as a requirement for entry into Holy Orders. In other words, it did not matter if a clerical son was born before his father became a priest or afterward, for in either scenario he was barred from ordination to the priesthood. The dissemination of the Poitiers, Melfi, and Clermont canons led to a blanket refusal of all who were born of men in Holy Orders.

The Norman councils largely ignored the issue of clerical sons and their ordination. The Rouen synod (1055), called by the archbishop Maurilius, prohibited priests’ sons from inheriting their fathers’ churches but said nothing about their ordination. The next Norman councils to discuss the problem of clerical marriage—Lisieux (1054/5), Lisieux (1064), Rouen (1072), and Lillebonne (1080)—did not address the position of clerical sons at all.⁶⁰ From 1080 to 1091, no synods were held. The next major one, at Rouen in 1096, did not pass any decrees on clerical marriage or clerical sons, although both Bishop Gilbert of Evreux and Bishop Serlo of Sées had been sent to Urban’s Clermont council (1095).⁶¹ The Rouen synod had been called to disseminate the Clermont canons, but the bishops who presided over it, William Bona Anima, Odo of Bayeux, Gilbert of Evreux, and Serlo of Sées, chose not to promulgate the most restrictive law on the ordination of clerical sons, a law that banned them from any of the major orders.⁶² Normandy had not entertained decrees against clerical sons since the Lisieux council (1055), forty years earlier. One has to wonder if there was a reason for their omission. Bona Anima was the son of a former bishop of Sées; Odo had a son who served as chaplain to Henry I and he was a known supporter of priests’ sons.⁶³ Is it possible that, under the leadership of these two bishops, the most personally relevant and inflammatory of these canons were not promulgated? After all, when archbishop John of

Avranches put forth the ban on clerical marriage at the Rouen synod of 1072, he was stoned out of the assembly. Odo of Bayeux and Gilbert of Evreux had been present at that convocation.

Perhaps the discreet abandonment of those canons was only an acknowledgment of the entrenched custom of clerical marriages and hereditary dynasties in Normandy and the difficulties with their eradication. Or was the exclusion of these canons a symbol of the commitment to Norman customs? Bona Anima and Odo were arguably the two most powerful prelates at the 1096 synod, the former the metropolitan of territorial Normandy and the latter the bishop of its wealthiest diocese. William Bona Anima had served under the monastic reformer Maurilius as a canon at Rouen, entered monastic orders under Lanfranc at Bec, and taught as the schoolmaster at St. Stephen's before becoming its abbot (1070–1079). He was a zealous administrator at the monastery and was eventually selected as archbishop of Rouen (1079–1110), where he ruled during an incredibly important time for the Gregorian campaign against clerical marriage and clerical sons in Normandy. Bona Anima's leadership during this pivotal time, along with his status as the son of a priest, has led George Williams to argue that the bishop was the "Norman Anonymous," the writer (discussed in Chapter 4) who passionately argued for the rights of priests' sons and for clerical marriage. Bona Anima, while canonically elected as archbishop, was still banned by Pope Gregory VII on the grounds of illegitimacy; he was the son of a priest, born before his father entered the priesthood.⁶⁴ Such hostility toward clerical sons illustrates that birth time was irrelevant to reformers; all sons of priests were banned from Holy Orders. Further opposition to the law likely came from Odo of Bayeux. Odo was a different sort of prelate, one who might have been expected to defend clerical sons and married priests. Although Odo was no friend of the Gregorian papacy, his role in excluding the Clermont canons from promulgation was likely very practical: not only did he have a son who was a cleric, he also had married clerics and their sons serving his cathedral chapter. Enforcement of the Clermont canons would have removed a good portion of the cathedral clerics at Bayeux.

Restrictive decrees against clerical sons were more easily disseminated across the English Channel, although not with much success. Anselm's council at Westminster took a different approach to the problem by prohibiting priests' sons from inheriting their fathers' churches.⁶⁵ Anselm was well aware that hereditary dynasties were a problem in and outside the Anglo-Norman realm.⁶⁶ There was no similar legislation promulgated in territorial Normandy, although

decrees on clerical marriage and concubinage were similar on both sides of the Channel. Anselm's council was attended by bishops Robert Bloet of Lincoln, Roger of Salisbury, Maurice of London, and Samson of Worcester, all married (or in publicly known unions) and most the fathers of clerics. It is important to note that Westminster did not prohibit the *ordination* of priests' sons and their appointment to another church. Was this an intentional exclusion? Such a decree and its loophole were in the spirit of later papal canons, such as those of Alexander III, who prohibited hereditary succession from priest to son but allowed the son to serve the same church if a third party interrupted the succession.⁶⁷ Under Anselm's canon, it would have been lawful for a priest's son to be appointed to his *uncle's* benefice or acquire another church position elsewhere. Such a measure, even with as many loopholes as this one, was clearly unpopular among the secular clergy, and Anselm acknowledged problems with its implementation.

In 1102, Pope Paschal II wrote two letters to Anselm, who requested advice on the problem of clerical sons. Anselm's portrayal of the situation indicated that the clerical sons of priests would "return entirely to the filth of the world unless promoted to holy orders."⁶⁸ It appears that these men were willing to leave the Church if they were not promoted to a higher rank. Paschal referred Anselm to Pope Urban's decrees from 1099.⁶⁹ Paschal clarified his position on the issue in another letter, written later the same year, in which he advised Anselm that, if the sons of a priests or deacons had already been promoted within the Church and if they could not be further promoted, they should be allowed to remain in their position. Paschal made clear that, for these men, "since the guilt clings to them through that evil practice [concubinage/fornication] and not through any sin of their own it seems wrong to pass sentence of deposition against them if they have been found worthy in other respects."⁷⁰ With this statement, Paschal acknowledged that the bodies of clerical sons were somehow tainted by their fathers' actions, although this sin did not effectively transform them into disorderly men themselves. This sentiment was later echoed by supporters of clerical sons.

It appears Paschal made such decisions out of practical considerations. Several years later, he acknowledged to Anselm that there were so many priests' sons in positions in the English Church that "almost the greater and better part of the clergy is subject to censure in this respect," and left it to Anselm to make the appropriate dispensations as necessary. The practice of clerical sons entering Holy Orders was so entrenched culturally it would have been

difficult to remove them or ban them entirely. Paschal stipulated to Anselm that he select clerical sons “whose knowledge and life” qualified them for Holy Orders; in other words, the pope accepted that men of honorable and chaste standing could serve the altar in spite of their birth status. Paschal did not, however, want the admission of clerical sons to Holy Orders to become a legal custom; he ordered Anselm to dispense as necessary, but “in such a way that no precedent is established for ecclesiastical policy in the future.”⁷¹ The Council of Westminster in 1108 focused on clerical celibacy and removed this ban on the ordination of clerical sons, undoubtedly in response to the exigent circumstances of the time.⁷²

Later ecclesiastical councils continued this trend in legislation, by focusing on preventing hereditary benefices but not specifically banning the ordination of clerical sons. The 1125 London council and the 1138 legatine council at Westminster both reiterated prohibitions on hereditary benefices. While legatine councils were also held in 1127 and 1129, neither council specified laws against hereditary benefices.⁷³ Conciliar legislation directed against clerical sons was inconsistent. While early efforts were directed at preventing sons of clerics from being ordained to major orders, reformers seemed to have abandoned this effort and focused on removing ecclesiastical inheritance as a way to discourage clerical procreation.

How successful were these laws? As Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux indicated in an 1178 letter, after forcing his canons to cast aside their wives, newer recruits fell back into the old habits, and “the whole neighborhood was celebrating the new cradles.” The canons did attempt to cover their relationships with women, but Arnulf suspected their indiscretions anyway.⁷⁴ This raises doubt about the real efficacy of laws directed against clerical marriage and the ordination and appointment of clerical sons; it also brings to the forefront the question of how well these families were publicly known to exist. The reformist campaign directed against these issues must have achieved some effect, in spite of the cultural traditions of the Anglo-Norman world. Before 1100, many elite clerics still publicly associated themselves with their sons, in charters and other documents of the time; by 1150, these numbers had declined significantly. After 1150, it would appear that almost no clerics had sons, and the ones associated with their offspring are notable.⁷⁵ In contrast, the number of clerical nephews rises quite sharply after 1150! Christopher Brooke has argued that marriage died out among the upper clergy at this time and that clerical celibates found new ways to continue the practice of nepotism, quite literally through

their nephews.⁷⁶ Julia Barrow has argued otherwise based on her analysis of the diocese of Hereford and shown that hereditary succession among cathedral clergy may have been the standard until the middle of the twelfth century. After 1150, married sons of canons ceased to inherit their fathers' prebends. The sons of priests, however, continued to be appointed to church benefices, most often those not controlled by their fathers. In the 1170s, Bishop Robert Foliot obtained a papal mandate, *Quia clerici quidam*, to prevent priests from placing their sons in other churches, which they had been doing to bypass this very restriction.⁷⁷ How effective this move was is not entirely known, but territorial Normandy continued to see the same practices. In 1186–1187, Pope Urban III noted in a letter to the abbot of Fécamp that, in Norman churches, “although foreign to the sacred canons is [this custom] that the son of the father succeeds, without intermediary, to the sanctuary of God as if by hereditary right.”⁷⁸ While reformers had been largely successful at preventing clerical sons from obtaining elite positions, the lower clergy still continued this practice.

Very little changed by the late Middle Ages, except with regard to the training of clerical sons. If cathedral chapters like Bayeux fostered a masculine identity in clerical sons, one that integrated a religious vocation with secular conceptions of manliness, then undoubtedly this gender performance continued as sons apprenticed under their own fathers. With celibacy the enforced rule of the priesthood, it was no longer possible for any cathedral school or similar environment publicly to support the training and education of men born from illegal unions. Fostering would have been similarly difficult. It is readily apparent that, particularly in rural areas, priests of the lower clergy trained their own sons for clerical careers, as synodal legislation from the later Middle Ages indicates. A Rouen synod (ca. 1231–1235) decreed not only that priests should remove their sons from their homes but also that “it is forbidden that they should assist or minister (*assistant vel ministrent*) with them in the churches.” A decree from a synod at Coutances similarly ordered priests to remove their sons from their homes out of fear that the sons would be assisting their fathers at the altar.⁷⁹ Later decrees at Bayeux (1300), Lisieux (1448), and Rouen (1445) repeated this admonition, suggesting such apprenticeships continued among the lower clergy.⁸⁰

Clerical sons were not entirely barred from ministry, as many did receive dispensations. Ecclesiastical officials were aware that enforcing such legislation against clerical sons may have resulted in a shortage of priests to staff the parishes. Even Anselm, in his letter to Pope Paschal II, had to ask for guidance con-

cerning the number of priests' sons who occupied parish positions in his realm; who would administer the sacraments if they were removed and no replacements could be found?⁸¹ This practice of sacerdotal dynasties, combined with the shortage of priests, yielded a number of papal dispensations granted to the sons of priests for entry into the priesthood.⁸² Nicolas de Druval, a cleric from the diocese of Lisieux, had been born of a priest and an unmarried woman; he was granted a dispensation in 1259 by Pope Alexander IV to be promoted into Holy Orders and receive a benefice with cure of souls.⁸³ Philip de Columba, a cleric from the diocese of Bayeux, also received a dispensation because he had been born of an illegitimate union of a cleric in minor orders and an unmarried woman.⁸⁴ Dispensations offered the Church a controlled manner in which to ordain clerical sons who practiced the correct gender identity. While, in theory, sons of priests faced barriers entering the Church, some could find success in church administration, despite illegitimate birth. Guillaume de Saane began as a canon in the cathedral chapter of Rouen, became archdeacon of the French Vexin and of Eu, and then treasurer of the chapter at Rouen. He achieved all this despite being the son of a priest and an unmarried woman.⁸⁵ These examples of legitimate entry into the priesthood should not obscure the reality that many priests' sons did acquire benefices illegally, without papal dispensation.

Hereditary dynasties did decline, and so did the numbers of clerical sons who were ordained. The historical record gives the impression that clerical celibacy may have been enforced so successfully that no more sons of priests were born after 1150; this is highly unlikely, since no effective administrative apparatus was in place for enforcement. It is more probable that celibacy decrees were wholly ineffective, sons were born, and these sons were publicly claimed as nephews so that they could be appointed to their fathers' churches and benefices. As clerical nephews, they faced neither discrimination nor persecution from reformers. While the term *nepos* could be used to describe any blood relation, it could also be seen as a euphemism for the term "son."⁸⁶ This was especially true in the latter half of the twelfth century, where, on both sides of the Channel, clerical sons of the elite seemingly disappeared overnight, while at the same time a large number of nephews appeared on the ecclesiastical stage. For cathedral positions that carried the most power, that of archdeacon and dean of the chapter, there was a strong tendency toward nepotism of both kinds.

It would be naïve to suggest that the body of Anglo-Norman elite clergy, those men with the most numerous ties to aristocratic dynasties, as a cohort decided one day to abide by the mandates on clerical celibacy, especially in an era

where there existed no bona fide system of visitation and discipline to eradicate these practices. Just as clerics found innovative ways around the laws preventing them from cohabitation with women, the sons of clerics and their fathers created alternative means to secure the inheritance of their paternal benefices. Gerard, archbishop of York, informed Anselm that canons in his diocese were refusing to abide by the statutes of Westminster. Gerard admitted to negotiating with an archdeacon who was the son of a priest. The archdeacon paid him a sum of money in exchange for obtaining his father's prebend, although the father was still living. This was not unheard of, as the case of the church of Mendlesham (above) indicates. It seems that some clerical fathers and sons secured the son's "inheritance" before the father's death. While Gerard was complicit in the transaction, he later admitted to Anselm that it was dishonorable and that he attempted to undo the exchange, but the other party refused.⁸⁷

For Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux, the key issue was whether the clerical son was born before or after his father's ordination. Arnulf presided over a matter regarding a priest's son from the neighboring diocese of Bayeux. Robert, the priest's son, tried to appropriate the church of Cormelain, for which another cleric, Richard Urselli, asserted proprietary rights. Although the church was outside Bayeux, the bishop of that diocese had never heard the case. Robert instead brought the petition to Achard, bishop of Avranches, for a judgment, in an attempt to cover the truth of his identity. Richard Urselli had been rector of the church for over thirty years but employed vicars to serve the church. Robert's father had been one of those vicars and had assisted his son by providing him false documents of possession, "so that he might receive some of those things that belonged to his father in the execution of his parish duties and that he used for his own needs, his mother, and the rest of the paternal family."⁸⁸ Arnulf concluded that "it is not advantageous to our province . . . for sons of priests to be appointed to the altars of their fathers." Concubinage should be eradicated and "impure offspring should not pollute the sanctuary of God as the example of paternal depravity."⁸⁹

For Arnulf, the impurity of priests' sons was tied to the status of their fathers at birth. For instance, in another case the bishop wrote a letter in support of a priest's son who was a candidate for the episcopal see of Bath. Reginald's consecration had been delayed in part to accusations of his questionable birth. Arnulf testified that Reginald had been born before his father, Jocelyn, bishop of Salisbury, took Holy Orders. Thus, Jocelyn was not a priest and not bound by celibacy at the time of his son's birth. His letter of support called Reginald "a

man whose prudence, honesty, virtue and industry have become publicly known by many and credible proofs.”⁹⁰

What did Arnulf think of his own nephew, Hugh of Nonant, who became bishop of Coventry (1188–1198) and fathered a son? Arnulf’s disappointment with his nephews has already been discussed. Aside from their greed and ingratitude toward their uncle, the major conflict between the bishop and his nephews surrounded the prelate’s refusal to bestow benefices on their own nephews, their *nepotulis*. In a letter to Pope Alexander III, Arnulf complained that, while he had educated them “almost from the cradle,” bestowed church appointments on them, and “made them illustrious with honors,” they were ungrateful because he refused to grant the “little nephews” the vacant benefices in his diocese.⁹¹ Arnulf’s defense of his actions was very reasonable: he selected men for ecclesiastical appointments based on their character. Sylvester and Hugh attributed his refusal as “contempt for my blood relatives and to their injury,” while Arnulf’s response was that “the church does not deserve to be blasphemed by the disapprobation of others.”⁹² This is a very interesting case, for Arnulf, by his refusal to grant his great-nephews a position in his church, was breaking his own family tradition. Arnulf’s appointment had been made possible by his own uncle, John, bishop of Lisieux. He, in turn, promoted and bestowed multiple ecclesiastical dignities on his own nephews. Why would such a notable bishop, from a prominent clerical family, suddenly refuse to patronize his kin? His comments insinuate that, by bestowing vacant benefices on his “little nephews,” the church would be “blasphemed,” and this implies some greater transgression had occurred. There is one, very clear explanation for Arnulf’s refusal and for why this decision so angered Sylvester and Hugh of Nonant. These “little nephews” were actually the sons of Hugh and Sylvester. By Arnulf’s own words, Hugh of Nonant controlled a vast number of church offices, including “two prebends worth 100 pounds in the churches of Lisieux and Bayeux, one archdeaconry of [Gacé] 200 pounds, three parish churches at 50 pounds, and a deanery of 50 or 60 pounds in the church of Lisieux.”⁹³ A conservative estimate places Hugh’s annual income at 400 pounds! This vast sum makes it even more incredible that Hugh did not bestow any of these appointments on his nephew. But if these nephews were actually sons, the transmission of these benefices would have placed these offices in jeopardy.

What is more interesting is that Hugh did not bother to conceal his son or use the more common language *nepos* in doing so. Hugh’s son Philip appears in three charters dated from the late 1180s, where he is noted as *filius episcopi*.⁹⁴

The date of Philip's birth is unknown; however, Hugh had a long clerical career under the guidance of his uncle Arnulf. He was noted as an archdeacon in a Norman charter in 1169, yet there is evidence he was a canon at Bayeux as early as 1145; he held a large number of canonries and prebends.⁹⁵ While it is possible Philip was born before Hugh became a bishop, it is almost certain he was born after Hugh entered an ecclesiastical career under his uncle's tutelage. Hugh's somewhat public proclamation of his son's identity would indicate something else about the state of the campaign against priests' sons: that, in certain circles, these men were socially accepted as legitimate sons, while at the same time legally bastardized.

Undoubtedly, the laws against the ordination of clerical sons affected the livelihoods and social status of these men. While the laws may have been ignored by some powerful bishops, clerical sons were still vulnerable to the changes in diocesan leadership, particularly with the installation of hostile reformers into those positions. Canon law held these men as impure offspring, reminders that their fathers failed to accept the manly priest model of masculinity. Clerical sons were not judged by their individual self-control or manliness, their own *virtus*. They were instead marginalized by the ban on their ordination and the deprivation of their inheritances. As a result, their social status, and by extension, their own manliness, was also called into question. Their voices speak to this ordeal.

Chapter 4



“The Natural Right of a Man”: The Clerical Defense of Traditional Masculinity

A poem from the late eleventh or early twelfth century shares the feelings of a married priest:

We married clergy were born to be made fun of, to be ridiculed, to be criticized by everyone . . . you draw up harsh laws, bitter statutes, and make things generally impossible for us. You deny it is right to touch a woman’s bed and to consummate the marriage rite in the bridal chamber. But it is the natural right of a man to enjoy his wife . . . this response rightly takes account of the laws of nature: if no one propagated, if no man procreated, everything would come to an end . . . a half man, an effeminate, you steal the prostitute’s joys. . you are driven by a lust which all of nature abhors.¹

Serlo of Bayeux, the likely author of this passage, speaks with the perspective of a married cleric at a time of transition.² He points to the ridicule, the shame, and the dishonor created by laws banning clerical marriage. He suggests that such laws are new and severe, that such decrees do not consider the real effects on clerical families. He points to the importance of procreative sexuality and its place in the “natural order.” Finally, he lashes out at the perceived instigators of such laws: sodomite reformers. In short, Serlo of Bayeux touches on all the major points used by clerical writers for the defense of clerical marriage in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries in Normandy. These writers were clearly defending the right to take a wife in their texts, but they were also react-

ing to the ideology of the manly celibate, the gendered model behind the legal discourse promoting celibacy. As discussed in Chapter 1, this paradigm was part of an agenda to “masculinize” religious life, characterizing ascetic self-denial and the struggle against sexual desires as performances of manliness.³

Married clerics did not remain silent, however, as celibacy legislation was introduced and gradually enforced. Celibacy laws, which sought to impose a new standard on the priestly body, prompted the creation of a resisting discourse, one that not only defended clerics’ right to marry but also defended the necessity of procreative sexuality. In some cases, these writers did not deny that celibacy was a higher, even more desirable state; they did, however, defend marriage as an alternative and legitimate performance of manliness for the clerical life and one that might be considered a kind of “moral moderation.”⁴ The texts written by married clerics and their advocates allow scholars the unique opportunity to understand the perspective of married priests, and also that of their sons, at a time of transition. Instead of provoking crisis, the legal discourse of clerical celibacy provided an opportunity for advocates to defend clerical marriage and procreation.

The Norman treatises that defended clerical marriage were authored before the year 1123, when the ecumenical council Lateran I took the unequivocal step of dissolving all marriage contracts of clerics in major orders.⁵ At the time these treatises were written, clerical marriage was still *legally valid*; Anglo-Norman decrees had never declared these unions invalid but had only stipulated the separation of clerical husbands and their wives and the cessation of sexual relations. The language used to describe these unions had already changed, however, as references to “concubine” (instead of “wife”) were quickly being utilized in legal discourse. In the currency of reform-era language, clerical marriage no longer existed. But in the mindset of clerical advocates, these marriages were not only valid but had always existed with social and ecclesiastical acceptance. The voices that supported clerical marriages, while passionate and polemical, do not appear to have had doubts about their gender identity. The Norman texts written in favor of clerical marriage and ordination of clerical sons underscore the connection between manliness and marriage, virility and procreation, as well as the importance of social status.⁶ The treatises examined below show that, at least among elite clerics, there existed a conception of masculinity that fit the lay model more than the monastic one.

Clerical Writers and the Context of Their Defense

Previously, scholars asserted that the writers of these pro-marriage tracts derived their ideas from a common source, the so-called *Rescripta* attributed at different times to both Bishop Ulric of Augsburg (923–73) and to Bishop Ulric of Imola (1053–1063). More recently, Erwin Frauenknecht has argued that this letter originated in the German diocese of Constance.⁷ The *Rescripta* was thought to be a response to the celibacy decrees of Nicholas II, those harsh statutes that had shocked so many within the medieval Church, with the mandate for the laity to ban the church services of married priests. Married priests who did not separate from their wives faced excommunication if they continued to preside over Mass. The *Rescripta* may have also been written in response to similar reform efforts by Gregory VII at his 1075 synod.⁸ Anne Barstow has discussed in detail the *Rescripta* and accepted Augustin Fliche's assertion that the document influenced the writers of two other pro-marriage tracts, both living in Normandy.⁹ Frauenknecht has offered a different theory; the *Rescripta* was not the basis for these other writings, but the common source was Cassiodorus.¹⁰ If this theory holds correct, then the marriage treatises discussed below are more culturally relevant than previously thought; they are more indicative of a Norman cultural attitude to clerical marriage and less a simple rendition of another pro-marriage tract. The *Rescripta*'s emphasis on the scriptural and patristic foundations for clerical marriage, along with the idea that the enforcement of celibacy would force priests to commit more heinous sins, are all ideas found, to some extent, in the Norman texts, the *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio*, the *Treatise on Grace*,¹¹ and the writings of the Norman Anonymous. The *Rescripta* may have been a response to the Roman celibacy decrees, but the use of similar ideas by Norman writers shows that a resisting discourse had developed in this region as well. Furthermore, the texts, while similar in many ways, also emphasize different key elements in the defense of clerical marriage. When examined together, they reveal a very strong cultural outlook on masculinity and sexuality; they also illustrate a common resistance to the destruction of clerical marriages and clerical families. It is perhaps the only time that the collective voices of married clerics can be heard, and it is resoundingly a strong, gendered defense of clerical marriage.

These texts were written in a relatively short timespan, although precise dating and even geographical origins are inconclusive. The four primary texts on clerical marriage for Normandy are the *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio*

(c. 1077–1078), the *Treatise on Grace*, and tracts J22/26 and J25 written by the Norman Anonymous (c. 1102–1110).¹² These writings were influenced by the resurgence of celibacy legislation and enforcement in this region. These authors were likely associated with the cathedral chapters of Normandy, where they would have obtained significant education and experience in environments where clerical marriage flourished; their use of scriptural and patristic writings underscores their connection to an educational center. While scholars have assumed the *Tractatus* was a response to the celibacy decrees passed by either of the ecumenical councils at Poitiers and Autun, it is as likely that the more geographically relevant 1072 Council of Rouen, held under the archbishop John d'Avranches, and/or the 1076 Council of Winchester, held under archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury, prompted the creation of this text; and that the *Treatise on Grace*, along with the Norman Anonymous J22/26 and J25 tracts, was written almost a generation later, as a response to the anti-clerical marriage legislation of Anselm of Canterbury in 1102 or 1108. Thus, all these texts, to some degree, were influenced by Anglo-Norman ecclesiastical reform. The ecumenical decrees that would unequivocally dissolve clerical marriages were not to come until the second and third decades of the twelfth century with Lateran I (1123) and Lateran II (1139). These councils destroyed clerical marriage, at least in theory.¹³

These texts functioned as a response to local and regional efforts to destroy clerical unions. The authors of these documents directed their polemics to an ambiguous group they call “reformers,” promoters of clerical celibacy, who were linked to Rome, sodomy, and the “new” legislation. These texts share some common arguments, but they also focus distinctly on issues that the particular author found most disturbing. In this manner, we can see the personal perspective of a cleric defending his ability to marry, along with how marriage impinged on his masculine identity. The author of the *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio* was probably a cathedral canon or cleric, possibly even an archdeacon.¹⁴ The date and geographical origins of the writing are in dispute; at the very least, we know that the document originated somewhere in northern France (including Normandy) and sometime between 1075 and 1078. While there are many plausible theories of origin, there are strong reasons to believe the document originated within the archdiocese of Rouen.¹⁵ The cleric who wrote the *Treatise on Grace* was familiar with the theological work of Anselm of Bec and drew on that work in his defense of marriage.¹⁶ The Norman Anonymous authored many tracts and has still escaped conclusive identification, although George

Williams believes him to be William Bona Anima, abbot of St. Stephen's of Caen (1070–1079), later archbishop of Rouen (1079–1110), and son of a Norman bishop.¹⁷ If Bona Anima was the author of these texts, then he would be one of the few vocal monastic proponents of clerical marriage. The tracts J22/26, *Apologia pro filiis sacerdotum et concubinarum*, and J25, *Scire velim quis primus instituit*, concern clerical marriage and the ordination of clerical sons. The J25 tract shares common elements with the *Treatise on Grace*, and this suggests that one of the authors had read the work of the other. What is notable about tract J25 is that it too uses Anselmian language, even taking direct passages from Anselm's *Cur deus homo*. Thus, the Norman Anonymous was well versed in Anselm's work, and his tract was more likely a response to Anselm's conciliar legislation against clerical marriage than a reaction to the Council of Rouen in 1096, as has been previously argued.¹⁸

These writers created arguments that reflected an Anglo-Norman clerical identity. Their tracts offer proof that clerics strongly resisted clerical celibacy and that they could offer logical, well-constructed arguments for the legitimacy of clerical unions. These texts, then, were part of a crucial time period when secular clerics sought to preserve their customs.

The Justification of Clerical Marriage and the Control of the Male Body

Advocates of clerical marriage did not view sexuality and religious identity as mutually exclusive, incompatible life experiences. A cleric in the major orders of priest, deacon, and subdeacon could reasonably expect to preside over a household in the same manner as a layman of the same social stratum and thereby achieve the same degree of masculine status. These pro-marriage texts illustrate the common concerns of their authors on the changing norms of masculine social identity as it related to their religious vocation. One of the central ideas that they refuted was the reformist belief that clerical marriage was unlawful and impure. To counter this claim, the advocates of clerical marriage justified such unions on the basis of historical precedent, showing with a deep knowledge of scripture that the Bible permitted priestly marriage.

All the authors begin their defense by arguing that clerical marriage had always had a place in both scripture and ecclesiastical tradition and that the laws against such marriages were new inventions. For example, the *Tractatus* emphasizes the idea that legitimate marriage had always been permitted to

priests, and such unions were neither adultery nor fornication (*adulterina vel fornicaria*), as the “architects” of the new laws (*novi dogmatis*) suggest.¹⁹ The author then insinuates that, because such laws were not traditional, the “foreign hypocrisy” who promoted these laws were “adulterators of the canons and the creators of new traditions.”²⁰ Elsewhere, he quotes the book of Job, to once again claim that reformers were “creators of lies and cultivators of perverse laws” (*fabricators esse mendatii et cultores perversorum dogmatum*).²¹ Throughout the tract, the *Tractatus* author places the reformers in a suspect category, attacking their honor with accusations of mendacity. In a manner of speaking, he further suggests that enforced celibacy was a perverse condition. Reformers, he argued, went against societal tradition with these laws, even defeating what had been firmly established through scripture.

The Norman Anonymous also used a polemic that refuted any notion that celibacy decrees were biblical. In his tract J25, the writer began by questioning whose ordinance it was to institute celibacy. He decided that it was a “tradition of man” not “an institution of God.” Such decrees could not be found in either the Old or New Testament or in the writings of the apostles. The author used the same line of thinking as the *Tractatus* author, by offering the same biblical support for his argument. If the Apostle (Paul) did not intend for priests to marry, he would not have stated that a “bishop should be the husband of one wife [1 Tim. 3:2].” The Norman Anonymous extends his discussion farther than the *Tractatus* author, by attacking the traditionally used nuptial imagery of the reforming Church. The writer denies the validity of the frequently used motif of “bishop as bridegroom” (of the Church), a term used in other regions of Europe, particularly the Holy Roman Empire. Nuptial imagery such as this was generally used in investiture ceremonies, to underscore the marriage of one bishop to his church.²² The writer argues that “the Holy Church is not the wife (*uxor*), nor the spouse (*sponsa*) of the priest, but of Christ.” He further points out that not only is this the true relationship but that it was legal, by apostolic tradition, for this “bridegroom” [Christ] to marry this Church.²³ Christ married the Church not as priest, but as king. The writer’s use of this analogy was indeed reflective of his royalist theology, but this rhetoric also had useful conclusions for married clerics. If a bishop was married to the Church and the “husband of one wife,” he would have been rendered either a bigamist or adulterer. The Norman Anonymous here presents scripture alongside the reform agenda to illuminate the problem of the priest being a husband to two wives.²⁴

As further proof that laws against clerical marriage were against tradition

and ungodly, the Norman Anonymous points out that marriage is a sacrament (sacramento) and indissoluble (*ut coniugium non separetur et dimissus aut dimissa*). In this manner, the author seemed to be responding to celibacy legislation with the same language and concepts used by reformers to regulate lay marriage. Although the indissolubility of marriage was first proposed by Augustine of Hippo, reformers increasingly emphasized the permanence of such unions, along with monogamy.²⁵ The sentiment that such laws against clerical marriage are new is also found in other writings from the region, including the early twelfth-century Serlo of Bayeux's *Defensio*, which rallies against the "new laws" and "harsh statutes" of the reformers, and the late eleventh-century letter of the Cambrai clergy, discussed below.²⁶

The impurity of clerical marriage is refuted as the impurity of illicit sexual unions is highlighted. Aside from their biblical defense of clerical marriage, the authors also tap into the view of self-restraint that reformers had offered as a necessity to demonstrate manliness; in this case, the authors use such a concept to justify marital unions. The *Tractatus* author points to the outcome of enforced celibacy when he writes that "every cleric will be either continent or married or a fornicator (*omnis vero clericus aut continens erit aut coniugatus aut fornicarius*)."²⁷ The author clearly does not approve of fornication. He emphasizes that all clerics are forbidden to have concubines (*mulieres subintroductae*), but they may have legitimate marriages; he offers a contrast between the legitimate conjugal union and the taint of fornication when he quotes Paul: "he who unites himself with a whore becomes one with her in body."²⁷ Furthermore, he views clerical marriage as a form of continence, stating that such unions are "chaste and pure" (*casta esse et sincera*).²⁸ The Norman Anonymous also makes a similar point when he defends his position in his J22/26 compositions. Here, the writer, after appealing for debate in J22 on the subject of clerical sons and their rights, offers an addendum (J26) in which he states clearly that his position is not a defense of sexual immorality (*ut nec fornicationi feramus patrocinium, ne peccatis hominum faueamus*).²⁹ More clearly, it appears that these writers were concerned with sexual purity and also aware that a defense of marriage would incite accusations of concubinage and fornication, at a time when lay marriage was subject to increasing restrictions.

These authors discussed sexual desire in such a way that implied the necessity of marriage. The *Treatise on Grace*, once again relying on Pauline authority, makes use of the biblical passage from Corinthians that states, "because of the present crisis, I think that it is good for a man to remain as he is" [1 Cor. 7:26].

"What is on account of the present crisis?" the author asks, "unless a weakness is present?"³⁰ The author goes on to suggest that such a "weakness" leaves one vulnerable to commit fornication if not married. The Norman Anonymous similarly makes a statement on sexuality in J25. In describing sex as the "ruin of filthiness" (*ruinam turpitudinis*), the Anonymous makes the case that it is relieved by the "honor of marriage" (*honestate nuptiarum*). Referring to Augustinian concepts once again, the Anonymous states that the good of marriage is threefold: fidelity (*fide*), offspring (*proles*), and the sacrament (*sacramentum*) that belongs to that institution. The fidelity of marriage, it is implied, prevents fornication with others.³¹

The three authors all point to the outcomes of male sexuality if marriage is denied to clerics; they all acknowledge that some clerics will be continent but also point to the impurity that will occur from the ban on marriage: fornication, incest, bestiality, and sodomy are all possible consequences of mandated celibacy. In this perspective, marriage is the proper vehicle for sexual expression and allows a man to enact a form of continence. Self-restraint was an important aspect of manliness, especially within the ideology of ascetic masculinity. The authors speak to this ideal by addressing the concern over bodily purity.

Free Will, Continence, and Honor

The cultural construction of the male body played a preeminent role in the defense of clerical marriage. Both the *Treatise* author and the Norman Anonymous constructed the male body as innately and sexually vulnerable, and such vulnerability could only be relieved through divine intervention. For the male bodies left uncorrected, marriage was prescribed. While arguing for this necessity, these authors highlighted the role of chastity in relation to free will and grace in a manner that not only legitimized clerical marriage but deemphasized the manliness of celibacy. Both the *Treatise* author and the Norman Anonymous connected free will and grace to the achievement of continence. Their use of common ideas can be traced back to the works of Anselm of Bec/Canterbury. While such ideas on free will and grace were employed by others outside the Bec school, only these two writers used it in conjunction with the defense of clerical marriage. Both authors agree that continence is a gift from God, without which it would be impossible to live up to the standards of celibacy. This argument had strong implications for the reform ideal of the manly celibate.

In the *Treatise on Grace*, the author says, "since therefore the good of con-

tinence, indeed every good, is the gift of divine grace alone, capable of being embraced neither through mandate, nor through one's own free will, they not only err but indeed they labor in vain, who attempt to force chastity on these men."³² It was futile to hold clerics to celibacy when achieving it lay not in their power but only as a gift from God. There are many, he comments, who, because of their own "infirmity" (*infirmittatem*), cannot attain the celibate state. Using the biblical example of Lot's sin of incest, the author asserts that, likewise, priests may commit worse crimes if forced into chastity; without the blessing of divine intervention, sexual transgressions such as sodomy, fornication, and incest could all occur from forcible celibacy. The author allows that continence is a better and higher state than marriage, but not for everyone.³³

In the J25 composition, the Norman Anonymous, employing the same argument as the *Treatise* author, states that "those who are continent have received continence from God," and, without this gift from God, they could not be chaste.³⁴ He further extends this argument by locating the origins of this incontinence in the "intemperance of the humour" (*intemperantia sue conspersio-nis*) and the "weakness of their mind" (*animi infirmitate*). Both conditions lead a man to fulfill the desires of the flesh. These men would not do such things if they had received from God "the grace and virtue of continence" (*continentiae gratiam et virtutem*). The writer explains that those who are not blessed by continence are driven by the "law in their members," which holds them "captive"; this "law," essentially the combination of sin and carnal desire, provokes them either to marry or fornicate. Such language on the "law in their members" (from Romans 7:23) is also found in the *Treatise on Grace* and, together with the emphasis on continence as a divine gift, strongly suggests that one of these writers had read the other's work. Regarding the "law in their members," the Anonymous says that the Apostle is perfectly clear. He quotes Paul's famous advice that it is "better to marry than burn with passion" (1 Cor. 7:9).³⁵ Like those writers before him, the Norman Anonymous alludes to problems that may arise from clerical celibacy. While not specifically mentioning sodomy, incest, or bestiality, the writer does distinguish between marriage and fornication, the former being the proper vehicle for the expression of sexuality. He suggests that celibacy may be impossible for some men, and his argument implies that sexual relations within marriage is the best way to restrain carnal desires.

The arguments produced by both authors have interesting implications for masculinity, particularly for the discourse of religious manliness produced by reformers. Reformers who advocated celibacy had offered that path as the

pinnacle of manliness. They viewed conquering the flesh and fighting sexual desires as the ultimate challenge, one that remasculinized the celibate body; this repeated performance suggested that fighting carnal desires is a natural, surmountable accomplishment of the male body. The argument of these two clerical authors, that celibacy could only be achieved as a gift from God, took the central component of ascetic masculinity, the fight against the flesh, and rendered it futile. How could there be a great struggle and great reward if what one earned (continence) was actually bestowed as a gift (from God)? At the very least, their arguments justified an alternative to manly celibacy in the form of marriage.

When Anglo-Norman ecclesiastical reformers honed their message on masculinity, the very one that dictated a code of proper manliness to elite men in an effort to prevent effeminacy, the message was clear: marriage, monogamous and indissoluble, was a necessary component of lay masculinity. The writer of the *Treatise on Grace*, perhaps aware of this agenda, extracted this argument and applied it to clerical men. He adopted a very different polemic regarding the meaning of the male body, by emphasizing the similarities between the clerical and lay bodies. "Why are we," he asks, "who are made from the same matter and assume the sin of the flesh from Adam's sin," not allowed wives?³⁶ By linking the physical nature of a priest with that of a layman, the author, intentionally or not, insinuates that both are men subjected to the same standards of manliness. Both groups of men suffer from sexual desires, and both inherit sin from Adam. The author makes the case that Paul, in his most famous letter to the Corinthians, gave the same advice to the laity and the clergy and that he made no distinction between the two groups. Reformers, this author maintains, try to enforce standards (celibacy) that they themselves do not abide by. This comparison completely disputes the reformist agenda to elevate clergy to a higher status over laymen.

The marital union was significant not only in terms of the relations between (conjugal) continence and conjugal sex but also because it played an important part in defining masculine honor. In the *Tractatus*, the author connects honor to the status of the woman in these unions, emphasizing the difference between legitimate wives (*uxores*) and concubines (*mulieres subintroductae*).³⁷ No cleric was permitted to engage in concubinage, an essentially illegitimate union. The author referenced the decrees of Lisieux from 1064 that had prohibited canons from having *mulieres subintroductae*, while noting that this decree was focused on fornication, not legitimate marriage. Clerics were allowed to marry

or remain chaste, but they were not permitted to indulge in illicit sexual behavior. The author was concerned that legitimately married women were equated with the less honorable status of concubine, probably because this association had negative implications for the priest and devalued the status of his marriage. This emphasis on legitimate wives suggests that, at the time of his composition in the late 1070s, clerics' women were still seen as wives and not concubines. The Norman Anonymous uses both terms, but in different treatises. In J25, he focuses mostly on the vocabulary of marriage, refraining for the most part from identifying the woman in the union as either *uxor* or *concubina*, except when quoting the Bible. Yet in J22/26, likely written before J25, he defends the sons of priests and their *concubines*. Nowhere in this particular treatise does the author use the term *uxor*. The terms used to describe the female partners of priests suggest that, by the time of his compositions, from 1102 to 1110, the Norman Anonymous could no longer assert the legitimacy of women married to priests.

The issue of honor is approached again when the *Tractatus* author alludes to the treatment of priests by the laity. He says married priests should not face censure by the laity, here referring to legislation that ordered parishioners to ban the church services of married priests.³⁸ The author is quite incensed that the laity were encouraged to judge their priest and states firmly that priests should only be judged by a formal ecclesiastical process, not by the "madness of the laity" (*non laicorum insania*), who beat, insult, and otherwise dishonor their priest. The laity are not qualified to judge their spiritual superiors, and the author points out the consequences of this abuse and ostracism. Such treatment forces priests to abandon their churches. Instead, parishioners should respect their priest, and, if judgment is due, then it should come from a legitimate ecclesiastical authority.³⁹ What is interesting here is that the clerical author of the *Tractatus* accepts the separate, elevated status of the clergy, an idea preached by a reforming Church. The laity is a separate group and is not in a position of authority over the priest. By banning the services of the priest, they usurp the higher status of his position. The author accepts the elevated social status that accompanies the clerical office; he does not, however, accept the forcible celibacy that accompanies the distinction between the clerical and lay states.

The *Tractatus* was likely read by the clergy who served the cathedrals of Cambrai and Noyon in the neighboring archdiocese of Rheims; their letters made explicit the relationship between lawful marriage and masculine honor. These letters, clearly written after the *Tractatus* in the late 1070s, show a com-

monality in thinking, as the authors used similar concepts of honor, sexuality, and masculinity in their polemical defense. The letter from the Cambrai clergy to the Noyon clergy tells how they once “enjoyed the highest honor and reverence, and the title of cleric, by God’s own design, was considered more honorable than others and also enjoyed the highest consideration.” But the anti-marriage laws changed this revered status, and “we have fallen into the contempt of our neighbors, and we have become a source of derision and mockery to those around us.”⁴⁰ The last statement likely refers to the ban on hearing Mass from a married priest and reflects the greater effort to involve the laity in disciplining unchaste clerics.

That these decrees were seen as an assault on their masculine honor is made clear in their letter:

In all this, we consider the injury done to our name and above all the infamy in the eyes of the laity, for whom we have become an object of derision. Moreover, it is unheard of before our eyes and seems to us contrary to custom and honor. If you are men, you will want to act manfully (*viriliter*); you must set little store by these councils, which inflict so many and so great humiliations upon us . . . we in no way consent to these prescriptions, which are as unheard of as they are dangerous. You’ve heard our resolution and arguments, the dangers, the ignominy, which menaces us if we put up no resistance.⁴¹

Laden with echoes of masculine pride, status, and public persona, these clerics speak to their most pressing concerns of enforced celibacy. Defamed and denigrated by the laity, these clerics experienced public humiliation. They saw enforced celibacy as “contrary to custom and honor.” This letter also suggests an important, often overlooked aspect of clerical marriage when the canons state that “we want to keep our previous customs, customs permitted by the wise moderation of our religious ancestors.” Custom resonated with them far more than the seemingly rogue decrees of celibate reformers. The response from the clergy of Noyon begins with a simple statement of solidarity: “to hope for the best in adversity and in keeping faith to resist emerging adversaries manfully.” The Noyon clergy underscored their view that this movement against clerical marriage and clerical sons was a fleeting one, not likely to withstand time.⁴²

These authors emphasized that continence is one path, while marriage is

another, and the division between these two can be connected back to the traditional emphasis valued by the monastic and clerical life. For priests who performed manliness like laymen, honor was deeply embedded in lawful marriage. To assume that marriage was no longer lawful for these clerics was an assault on their masculine honor. The idea of celibacy as a gift from God effectively took away the manliness of battling sexual temptations, a key component of religious manliness. If one could only achieve chastity by the grace of God, then constant battle against the flesh was futile; thus, the authors further explained, this could lead to greater transgressions, particularly for clerics not blessed by the grace of God. There was an alternative clerical masculinity to the ascetic model, and it was a masculinity that incorporated procreative sexuality.⁴³

The Uses of Sodomy and the “Naturalness” of Clerical Marriage

Advocates not only based their arguments for the necessity of marriage on lay models of manliness, they also employed an antithesis, an “anti-norm” in the form of sodomy. As these writers positioned marriage in opposition to sodomy, they emphasized the division between “natural” and “unnatural” sexuality. They also suggested, sometimes explicitly, that celibacy mandates originated with “sodomite” reformers. By defending their arguments based on “nature,” the advocates of clerical marriage employed a technique well-used by Christian reformers in their own definitions of manliness. Since “nature” reflected the divine plan, the use of this idea played a central role in religious reform.⁴⁴

Both the secular and regular clergy utilized accusations of sodomy and effeminacy against each other, as the occasion arose. As discussed in Chapter 1, monastic writers used charges of effeminacy to denigrate secular clerics and the lay elite, suggesting they were softened by women, uncontrollable lust, and fine clothing. Clerical writers also employed this strategy against their monastic critics; monks were most frequently rebuked with accusations of sodomy. Sodomy was popularly launched against marginal groups in medieval society; religious minorities, like the Cathars and Muslims, found themselves accused of such behavior.⁴⁵ Sodomy charges were used not only in this manner, but also against the more powerful in medieval society; as James Brundage has shown, kings and popes were not immune to such charges by their political enemies.⁴⁶

Sodomy accusations were an effective weapon against religious and political enemies precisely because it was linked to an unmanly, even effeminate disposition. Following this strategy, the *Treatise on Grace* author used the discourse

of the natural and the unnatural to underscore his point on clerical marriage and to cast sexual suspicion on the reformers who sought to eradicate it. He crafted an extensive argument by directly connecting the “unnatural” to sodomy, juxtaposing it with the “natural” act of marriage. By prohibiting clerical marriage, “the naturalness of marriage to one woman,” he argued, clerics will go on to engage in “unnatural” (*contra naturam*) practices, which may include “cursed sodomitical fornication” (*execrabilis sodomitica fornicatio*). His insinuation, like that of other writers, is that denying priests what is natural, marriage, will result in the unnatural, sodomy. Interestingly, sodomy is the first offense mentioned in a list of other sexual transgressions, and one particularly focused on by this writer. He states that other offenses, like adultery, the “unspeakable pollution” of prostitution, and even incest might also occur.⁴⁷ This line of thinking goes along with the presumption that uncontrolled sexuality will spill over into worse sexual sins; the author assumes that male sexuality, if uncontrolled, will create greater problems. By this logic, the author connects “natural” sexuality to marital sexuality and the control of the male body.

The Norman Anonymous also employed the division between natural and unnatural sexuality, but with a more subtle approach. He based the majority of his argument in J25 on the natural order and the place of marriage therein, asserting that procreative sexuality was ordained by God; in contrast to the *Tractatus* author, the Norman Anonymous never specifically mentions sodomy as a consequence of celibacy in his advocacy of marriage.⁴⁸ His argument sustained the essentialist view of masculinity by its emphasis on the naturalness of procreative sexuality. The eternal law, which is the law of God, he argues, forbids the disruption of the “natural order.” The mandate of celibacy, he concludes, blocks the “natural order” to be conserved. It is, therefore, against the law of God.⁴⁹ The writer acknowledges that it is good for some to be continent and virgins because God has preordained it. God also willed that some men reproduce. In short, God predestined the natural order of the world, so that men who are chaste and men who reproduce coexist as part of the divine plan. Reproduction, after all, is necessary for the creation of saints, the Anonymous adds. Without reproduction, the saintly would not have been born. Together with his argument on continence as a gift, the emphasis on divinely mandated procreation further destroys the idea of manly celibacy. Not only did God bless certain men with continence, he ordered certain others to procreate. Those who marry “desire to produce the fruit of marriage.”⁵⁰ With this statement, the author seems to suggest that procreation is the primary goal of marriage; this

idea would imply that even chaste marriages do not serve the natural order. Thus, the argument follows, efforts to enforce celibacy interrupt God's divine plan.

Sodomy was highlighted to an even greater extent in other literature of the period. The *Tractatus* author implicitly suggests that the creators of these laws are sexually suspect themselves when he accuses them of hypocrisy (*ypocrisis*), even saying that legitimately married clerics are persecuted while fornicators escape discipline.⁵¹ Other authors were more direct and even hostile toward the reformers. The Cambrai clergy noted that celibacy advocates "detest marriage because they practice with impiety and without respect a vice both abominable and without name," here referring to sodomy.⁵² But there was no narrative as hostile as that of Serlo of Bayeux, which distinguished between natural (marital) sexuality and non-normative sex. *Nos uxorati sumus* ("We Married Clergy") reveals the very perception that, while reformers portrayed clerical marriage as an abomination, the same reformers turned their heads at sodomy, the "unnatural" offense, and allowed it to run rampant without prosecution. His disgust at the practice of sodomy by reformers, as married clerics were persecuted, is palpable. Like other writers of the time, he defends his argument by recourse to a "natural order," saying that "this response rightly takes account of the laws of nature: if no one propagated, if no man procreated, everything would come to an end . . . you are driven by a lust which all of nature abhors." Furthermore, "in my judgment the correct opinion/holds the natural sin of the [bridal] bed/to be more venial than that contrary to nature." Serlo goes further in this poem by directly positing procreative sex as oppositional to sodomy, the former marking manliness, while the latter renders one "a half man, an effeminate (*semivir et mollis*)."⁵³ Serlo's final exhortation is for reformers to "leave us alone and chastise yourself, sodomite!"

At a time and in a region where marriage was prevalent among the secular clergy, the prohibition of this custom resulted in hostility between the two groups. What may have increased the tensions even further was the perception by the secular clergy that their critics, those behind mandated celibacy, were sodomites and that this behavior was not being penalized and eradicated in the same manner as clerical marriage. Far more than an unjustified anxiety, secular clergy may have had valid reasons for believing that sodomy was an unpunished offense, at least in comparison to clerical marriage. A survey of Anglo-Norman ecclesiastical councils between 1072–1128 shows that there was no legislation created against sodomy, with the exception of Anselm's 1102 Westminster decree; his was the first to criminalize sodomy, but may have not been pub-

lished.⁵⁴ In contrast, many of these councils contained some measure against clerical marriage. Anselm's decree stated that those who committed sodomy were barred from taking higher positions, if they were in religious orders; if they already held higher positions, then they were to be removed from office. Any laymen found guilty of such behavior were to be deprived of their social status and the privileges associated with that status. Finally, Anselm decreed that every Sunday the excommunication of sodomites would be renewed.⁵⁵ The monk William of Malmesbury, writing in 1125, made a rather curious statement: "the rule about sodomites being excommunicated every Sunday Anselm himself later changed, for good reasons; but that only encouraged the evil to break the other rules more freely."⁵⁶ William's remark is evidence that the decree of 1102 was published but that the last section had been modified. Furthermore, Anselm's 1108 council, the very one that took severe legal measures against married clerics, did not include any prohibitions on sodomy. Thus, far more than being a baseless criticism, it seems many secular clerics actually perceived that monastic reformers refused to persecute sodomites, while simultaneously prohibiting clerical marriage.

Those in the monastic community did acknowledge sodomy as a widespread problem, one affecting court and cloister alike. Notable monastic bishops launched a major effort against effeminacy and sodomy, as illustrated in Chapter 1. An atmosphere where such behavior was suspect may have led clerical writers to capitalize on an association between monastics and sodomy. Anselm, his own sexuality the subject of major scholarly examinations,⁵⁷ noted the pervasiveness of sodomy in twelfth-century England. In his letter to the archdeacon of Canterbury, Anselm noted that sodomy was so common a practice that "hardly anyone was ashamed of it and that many people, ignorant of its magnitude, fell headlong into it."⁵⁸ Bishop Herbert of Losinga also commented on the problem of sodomy, and his letter to one of his monks indicates that the bishop tried to eliminate the problem within monastery walls. He asks the monk, "shall he, who hath renounced the world and hath become a follower of Christ, wail for Adonis and worship Ganymede?"⁵⁹

Undoubtedly, those writers who raised the question of sodomy in relation to mandated celibacy knew that suspicion of such behavior could be associated with monastic life. Their attempt at creating an anti-norm, however, was not as successful as the advocates of sacerdotal celibacy. While sodomy legislation increased over the course of the next two centuries, the promulgation of these laws had no bearing on the war against clerical marriage.

The Voices of Clerical Sons

Reformers' recreation of the priestly body as one of chaste virility had implications not only for priests but also for their clerical sons. The reform agenda carried out in England and Normandy marginally positioned clerical sons between the clerical and lay spheres. While sons of other men could anticipate entry into the same masculine arena as their fathers, clerical sons found their birth status and their own gender identity compromised by legislation barring their entrance into Holy Orders. A priest's son, by his very existence, illustrated his father's lack of sexual control and failed adherence to the manly celibate ideal. The ban on clerical sons created an atmosphere of suspicion around these men, even those born before their fathers entered Holy Orders. Their livelihoods were radically disrupted by their inability, at least theoretically, to inherit any property or benefice. It exposed them to social stigmatization. At one time, a priest's son had legitimate birth status and masculine honor in his community, with a family of social standing, but virtually overnight all of it was destroyed through decrees designed to punish his father.

The custom that permitted clerical marriage also recognized clerical sons as legitimate heirs, able to follow in their fathers' footsteps if desired. Legitimate birth brought a full range of opportunities to a son; he could walk in his father's career footsteps, inherit his family's wealth and property, and fully embrace his own social status. Without legitimate birth, however, he was deprived of his inheritance, publicly shamed, and rendered vulnerable. He was deprived of the rites of passage that led him from apprentice to priest. He existed in a marginal state, unable to be fully accepted into either the clerical or lay spheres due to the sudden change in his birth status, and to no fault of his own.

This perspective of illegitimacy and marginality was reflected in the writings of four Norman writers who argued for the cause of clerical sons; their tracts are important for understanding their perceptions of clerical identity, masculinity, and the role of the secular clergy. Like the treatises on clerical marriage, the defense of clerical sons appeared in the form of theological treatises in which writers made complex arguments for why clerical sons did not bear the sins of their fathers. They characterized the attack on clerical sons as a part of the conflict with monks over authority and power. Above all, these writers expressed a sense that these men were marginalized by ecclesiastical reform and that their previous entitlements could be easily stripped away. Overall, a common point

made was that individual *virtus* should be the defining standard for judging the suitability of a clerical son for ordination.

No clerical writer expressed the profound sense of loss and legitimacy as the Norman cleric Serlo of Bayeux. Serlo was a priest's son and a canon at the cathedral chapter of Bayeux, and the author of nine extant poems, which, if viewed as autobiographical, provide a rare look at the changing status of priests' sons in the late eleventh century.⁶⁰ Serlo's poetry suggests that he was a third generation priest; his father and grandfather had held church land in the vicinity of the abbey of St. Stephen's.⁶¹ Four poems are directed against the monks of Caen, and all insinuate that the abbey was responsible for the deprivation of Serlo's benefice. These poems, written before 1079/80, use passionate, sarcastic, and even hostile language to describe this seizure.⁶² At times, Serlo pointedly describes his lost benefice as an ecclesiastical fief, one held by hereditary right but that was stolen; elsewhere, he describes his benefice as his patrimony, another indication that he believed this benefice to be a lawfully inherited form of property.⁶³

Quae monachi quaerunt was written sometime between 1079/80–1082, and insinuates that Serlo's land was encroached upon by the abbey of St. Stephen's in a campaign of "imminent domain"; under abbots Lanfranc, William Bona Anima, and Gislebert, the abbey had expanded its territory by appropriating smaller farms in its vicinity. The monastery's position so close to Caen meant that it continually negotiated with tenants and owners in order to expand its land, and often it entered into contentious litigation to do so.⁶⁴ Serlo suggests that Bishop Odo of Bayeux intervened on his behalf in his dispute with the abbey, but the bishop of Bayeux was prohibited by the abbey's papal privilege from interfering with its business or excommunicating its monks.⁶⁵ Essentially, the bishop of Bayeux had little to no legal power over the Caen monks. Serlo's invective against the monks of Caen and Abbot Gislebert exemplify the kind of hostility consistent with an unjust seizure of property. Since William Bona Anima was elected to the see of Rouen in 1079, it is likely that Gislebert, his successor, was the one who seized Serlo's property, probably on the basis of his "illegitimacy."

The *Quae monachi quaerunt* begins by asserting that the monks stole Serlo's land "by law" (*patrio mea jure fuerunt*), a confirmation that the change in the status of priests' sons placed them into a precarious legal state. This invective portrays the Caen monks as very worldly and wholly unconcerned with living

the ascetic life. Serlo states that he was “oppressed by poverty” (*me paupertate gravabit*) and shows confusion at the ability of the monks to deprive him of his patrimony: “Why are they trying to attack me?” (*mea cur invadere quaerunt?*). Throughout the poem, Serlo uses the language of shame (*Turpiter ergo gerunt*), frequently to emphasize the injury committed against him by the monks.⁶⁶ In his invective against Abbot Gislebert (*Invectio in Gillebertum abbatem*), Serlo shames the monk by highlighting his lack of self-control, simultaneously challenging his manliness by emphasizing the abbot’s gluttony. Abbot Gislebert enjoyed the best wine and the best plates of food and was unconcerned with fasting. Serlo states tartly that “no one in the world of God was so gluttonous.... you bear the bulk of a pregnant woman’s belly.” Serlo further attacks the abbot by saying that “you will become the woman in labor,” and by pointing out the obvious: “a woman by marriage becomes pregnant/you’re eating [like her].”⁶⁷ Serlo’s verse was clearly designed to show the hypocrisy of the Caen abbot, but it also showed his failure at meeting the standards of ascetic manliness; pointing out his lack of self-control suggested his effeminacy.

Serlo’s most famous poem linked the oppression of clerical sons noted in *Quae monachi quaerunt* to the efforts of sodomite monks. The *Defensio pro filiis presbyterorum* was written around around 1095–1096, possibly as a reaction to the Council of Clermont’s restrictions on clerical sons.⁶⁸ He challenged the notion that priests’ sons were impure and, thus, could not hold church benefices because of their so-called illegitimate birth; he argued instead that baptism effectively cleansed all Christians, regardless of birth status. Here he addressed the common reform idea that clerical sons were themselves signs of impurity. Serlo wrote that it was the “sodomites” who punished the sons of priests, although they led good lives. Serlo links dishonor to sodomy explicitly when he writes that “the men of dishonorable lives, are to me, sodomites/and who commits thefts, they rant at us in shame.” The key phrase here is the line “who commits thefts,” undoubtedly a reference to the monks of Caen. Serlo increases his polemic by asking, “What is the serious punishment pressed upon the lives of sodomites?” He questions the discrepancy in “the law that oppresses those good and encourages those inclined to evil things.”⁶⁹ For Serlo, individual *virtus* should be used to judge the worthiness of a clerical son for ordination. He questions, “why should a man bring shame upon those whom the supreme king honors?” These clerical sons, while “illegitimately born,” are, after all, men of “good morals” and “good lives.”⁷⁰ Serlo raises the issue of grace when he asks, “why does he condemningly pursue those whom Christ redeemed by his

death?"⁷¹ He then accuses reformers of banning what is lawful (clerical marriage) and hiding what is "a kind of illness which might cause an end to the human race."⁷² This idea is juxtaposed against the birth of priests' sons, who are born from procreative sexuality.

At some point, probably due to the benefaction of Odo, bishop of Bayeux, Serlo obtained a prebend at Bayeux cathedral. His later poems show less hostility than the early ones directed at St. Stephen's and provide us with a sense of how the status of clerical sons could change depending on the context. Serlo's position on the mortuary roll after Bishop Odo and successful townsman Conan indicates a person of high status in Bayeux. Since the Bayeux-Caen area was known for its hereditary dynasties, Serlo's loss suggests that clerical sons could face barriers even in regions that supported their ordination. It also raises the possibility that bishops who were themselves clerical sons may have protected other clerical sons at this transitional time, when increasingly such men were under attack. With frequent changes in diocesan and monastic leadership, clerical sons might see their livelihoods stripped away. Illegitimate birth could be used as justification for the legal alienation of property. Clearly not all priests' sons lost their churches due to their birth status, but, for the less powerful, this status could be exploited. Serlo's invective was more than the diatribe of an angry man. His poetry was a defense of his own honor, created by calling attention to the dishonor of the Caen monks, Abbot Gislebert, and sodomites, all of whom, in his mind, persecuted clerical sons.

The same technique of calling into question the honor and motivations of reformers is found in the *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio*. Like Serlo, the author of this document wrote in a passionate form, which suggests that he too was the son of a priest and possibly married himself. This writer refers to the prohibitions on priests' sons as "new" legislation, much like Serlo had in his poetry. Rather than launch an attack on sodomites as Serlo did, the writer argues for a historical precedent of clerical sons serving the apostolic church. Following that statement, the author presents numerous examples of early medieval popes who were the sons of clerics and who also defended the orthodoxy of the Church. Such honorable pontiffs as Boniface (whose father Iocundus was a priest), Felix III (his father a parish priest), Agapitus (his father the priest Giordanus), and Silverius (his father the priest Ormisda was himself a pope!) were all clerical sons but also honorable representatives of the Holy See.⁷³ The author then points out what must have been completely obvious to him and any other persons living in northern France and Normandy:

"We might name bishops, still alive today, in Italy, Gaul and Normandy, who descended from clerics, even from priests, and who were enthroned and ordained with the pope's permission, but we are of the opinion that this suffices, in order to avoid tediousness against the adulterators of the *canones* and the inventors of new traditions."⁷⁴

The *Tractatus* author also engaged in slanderous accusations, much like Serlo, but directed his attacks against the creators of the new laws by pointing out their love of greed (*turpis lucri gratia*). He takes his insults even further by calling these men "blind and deaf and slow-witted."⁷⁵ These innovators of new laws fail to understand that the Roman Church supports clerical sons and permits these men a place within their clergy. Instead, with obstinacy and foolishness, these reformers preach that clerical sons may not enter Holy Orders or receive any ecclesiastical dignity.⁷⁶ He calls on clerical sons to "not fear them" and to "refuse to be polluted by the depravity of heretical error."⁷⁷ Explicitly using the language of reform, the author reverses the primary justification used by reformers in their defense of sacramental purity. He pointedly states that reformers preach heresy about clerical sons, and to believe such notions is to give in to impurity. This author was bolder than even Serlo, for, although he did not insinuate that reformers were sodomites, he did call on his readers to refute their laws, under the penalty of excommunication.

Not all writers adopted a hostile polemic in defending clerical sons, even while adopting Serlo's arguments. Thibaud d'Étampes authored a defense of priests' sons in a letter written to Rosceline of Compiègne, a monk-philosopher widely known for his philosophical squabbles with other thinkers of the time. Thibaud's letter to Rosceline was written after Thibaud moved to Oxford, and most likely after 1119, since his letter mentions the decrees from the Council of Rheims. The canons of this council prohibited the transmission of hereditary benefices and included what was becoming fairly standard conciliar language on clerical concubinage.⁷⁸ Thibaud used Serlo's idea on the cleansing nature of baptism, and this underscores either that Thibaud was very familiar with Serlo's poetry or that similar thought circulated among the Anglo-Norman clergy.

If Thibaud did employ Serlo's concept of the cleansing power of baptism, he did not similarly utilize Serlo's rhetoric of honor and shame. This is surprising since his letter to Thurstan of York regarding the ordination of monks showed a high level of contempt for the monastic order. In that particular letter, he used disparaging language, calling monks "sheep" who should follow rather than lead, and describing how monks damned themselves by perpetual claustration.⁷⁹

Thibaud might have been the son of a priest, but it is more conclusive that he was associated with the school at Caen, a supportive environment for clerical sons. What seemed to provoke Thibaud's letter to Rosceline was canon 5 from the Council of Rheims which stated that those priests who had lapsed into sexual sin (clerical concubinage) could not be received back into the dignity of the priesthood.⁸⁰ Thibaud's argument was to the contrary: those "lapsed" priests should be allowed back into the priesthood, and their sons permitted to enter Holy Orders. Like Serlo, he defended the ability of priests' sons to become priests like their fathers, without regard to their illegitimate or "sinful" birth. In Thibaud's view, baptism allows one to become a "new man." Here he used the same "new man" model presented in the works of reform-minded writers: "let him be the new man generated from the womb of the Church."⁸¹

Thibaud acknowledged the intent of such laws, to control the body of the priestly father by way of marginalizing the son. By preventing the ordination of a priest's son, reformers believed they could stop a priest from succumbing to his sexual desires. Thibaud argued that the purpose of the law should be that "the sons of priests are not, therefore, restrained as outlaws, as ignorant men consider them, but that the priests are restrained from the desires of the flesh."⁸² Thibaud further argued, "if the son of a priest lives decently, he should be ordained. But if the son of a knight lives indecently, he should be repudiated."⁸³ Behavior, not birth status, must determine the qualification of a priest "if we are all [generated] from the same Father and from the same womb of the holy mother Church."⁸⁴ Like Serlo before him, he made the case that a clerical son should be judged on the basis of his *virtus*, not his birth status.

Thibaud's letter appears to make use of another defense of priests' sons, one composed by the canons of Noyon, discussed earlier. The canons of Noyon curiously argue that Christ was born of an adulterous union:

Indeed, against that [assertion] in which they contrive that sons of clerics ought to be barred from holy orders, is found a writing on the exposition of Christ's birth: "Our Lord Jesus Christ wished to be born not only of foreigners, but even from an adulterous union . . . that by whatever means we are born, we may follow in his footsteps . . ." And just as He is the true priest (*pontifex*), born from an adulterous union, so anyone born from any order, insofar as he shall have a perfect faith and shall fulfill in works what he holds in

faith, and shall be a learned man keeping a single wife, should by no means whatever be barred from the priesthood.⁸⁵

Just as Christ's birth was from adultery, so no man (cleric) should be denied ordination so long as he has faith. Additionally, the canons traced Christ's birth back through the generations, to his descent from the sexually licentious Tamar and her father-in-law Judah, down through King David.⁸⁶ The canons' point is clear: Christ did not choose his ancestors, any more than clerical sons chose to be born from their fathers. The sons of priests, then, are not responsible for the wickedness of their fathers. Thibaud illustrates his agreement by retelling the same story of Judah and Tamar, and he emphasizes that one cannot control the actions of one's father or ancestor. Clerical sons, therefore, must be judged by their individual behavior.⁸⁷

The strongest theological argument for the ordination of priests' sons came from the Norman Anonymous's best-known tract, *Apologia pro filiis sacerdotum et concubinarum* (J22/26). The tract shares similarities with the defenses authored by Serlo of Bayeux and Thibaud d'Étampes. This document was surely intended to be read and disseminated; at the end of tract J22, the writer requests commentary and corrections, and these appear in J26.⁸⁸ As a result, the writer incorporated a more extensive clarification of his points in J26, four paragraphs in the beginning and four in the end. J26 also ends with another call for discussion. It has been suggested that this tract was a response to the canons of Clermont passed by Urban in 1095, which should have been promulgated at the Rouen synod in 1096; yet those canons were not disseminated. While the exact date of the tracts is unknown, the language used ("the sons of priests and their concubines") suggests that priests' unions were no longer viewed as legitimate, thereby suggesting a date in the early twelfth century, likely between 1102 and 1110.

The Norman Anonymous's defense of clerical sons in J22/J26 shows, at the very least that, by the turn of the century in England and Normandy, clerical sons could not be guaranteed social or legal legitimacy. The writer did not launch into any practical considerations of the position of clerical sons but focused strictly on the theological issues connected to the status of these men. While his argument has overtones of Serlo's defense, the Anonymous provides a uniquely different argument, drawn from not only patristic and biblical sources but also the work of Anselm; this has raised the possibility that these treatises were written in response to Anselm's 1102 or 1108 councils.

The writer pointedly states, "God, I say, creates, not parents," and parents are only "assistants" (*ministri*); thus, children are not responsible for the actions of their parents, whether good or bad.⁸⁹ Expanding on his original argument from J22, the writer levels the question in J26, that, if parentage corrupts offspring (as argued for priests' sons), why do we not judge the children of murderers and thieves in the same manner? Like Thibaud, the Anonymous acknowledges that the purpose of these laws was to prevent priests from fornicating and to encourage them to lead a purer life.⁹⁰ This sentiment also suggests that clerical sons were not polluted bodies. The Anonymous also uses another part of Thibaud's argument, that men born of legitimate unions may be wicked ("vessels of violence"), just as men born of illegitimate unions may be good ("vessels of mercy").⁹¹ God created the sons of priests not "from the depravity of vice, but from the fertility of the seeds, not out of the filth of corruption, but from the natural good of the seed that is truly legitimate."⁹² Children of legitimate and illegitimate marriages are "both equally lost, if it was not for the fact that they are saved by the remedy of sacred baptism."⁹³

Like Serlo of Bayeux and Thibaud d'Étampes, the Norman Anonymous used the idea of grace by baptism; however, he developed his argument in a far more complex manner, exhibiting not hostility but an ability to justify clerical sons within the framework of the divine law. Like Serlo, he used the concept of honor and shame frequently within his argument, but always in the context of the human relationship with God; the language of shame (*obprobrium*, *inhonoratus*, *turpiter*) was never used to launch attacks on reformers but to illustrate the dishonor shown to God through the ban on clerical sons. The writer states that "for he who dishonors the son, dishonors God the father."⁹⁴ Further in the passage, he warns that "those who are unwilling to receive such men to Holy Orders and who scorn them, instead dishonor or scorn God, rather than those who are received and rejected."⁹⁵ Like Thibaud, he skillfully employs the "new man" motif, arguing that "he who rejects these men from the priesthood, rejects the *new men*, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of the truth . . . whoever is baptized is clothed [as the new man]."⁹⁶ Thus, this defender of clerical sons understood the reformers' model of manliness and responded with it.

The Norman Anonymous, in a similar yet milder manner than the *Tractatus* author, suggests that those who oppose the ordination of clerical sons are not following the law of God. Rather than urge excommunication, as the *Tractatus* author so bluntly advocated, the Anonymous states that such men who deny

the divine law are themselves barred from entering Holy Orders. The writer states, "But perhaps you will say: the law of the canons prohibit such men to be ordained"; he answers the question with a verse from Galatians [5:18]: "If you are led by the spirit, you are not under the law." He continues that, if clerical sons are not obligated to follow the law, those who "are not led by the spirit, . . . are prohibited from being ordained, according to the law of the canons."⁹⁷ In this manner, the writer turns the tables on the reformers who declare that clerical sons are ineligible for ordination.

The theological justification for the ordination of priests' sons in J22/26 shares much with the defense presented in J25, the writer's treatise on clerical marriage. In this tract, the writer uses the same argument as in J22/J26: that parents are not the creators of their children but "assistants" in their creation by God.⁹⁸ J25, however, differs from his other defense of clerical sons in that he uses election theory to argue that God has preordained selected men to serve the Church; the clergy's selection, therefore, is not decided by the Church. This argument goes farther than J22/26 by showing that a condemnation of clerical sons is a condemnation of God's plan. The Anonymous acknowledges that those responsible for celibacy laws, "believe even less that God takes priests' sons for the building of the heavenly city."⁹⁹ In fact, the writer argues, the sons of priests are needed to repopulate the angels; the ideas in this part of his defense are derived from Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, further evidence that the writer was responding to Anselm's legislation. He adds that those who are against clerical sons, in effect, attempt to block the plan of God, so that "he tries to destroy the predestination of God."¹⁰⁰ Not only are such men needed to repopulate the angels in heaven, but God created them "in a certain order" (*certo quidem ordine*); "he does nothing disorderly." God creates nothing that is not predesigned, so it is necessary that all men should be created in the manner that God intended them.¹⁰¹ With this argument, the Norman Anonymous justifies the existence of clerical sons, their ability to be ordained, and refutes the so-called pollution of their bodies. The bodies of clerical sons are not marginal but have a definite place within the divine plan.

The writings by the Norman Anonymous and others reveal an educated, clerical response to the celibacy legislation of the era. These voices saw clerical marriage as a component of clerical gender identity. These writers defended a clear, alternative religious masculinity to the ascetic ideology preached by reformers. By way of their arguments, they were able to weaken, if not obliterate, the ideal of manly celibacy. In a common polemical strategy, these authors

argued that priests would commit worse offenses if they were not married. They discursively constructed the male body as sexually vulnerable, unable to retain its integrity without marital sex. They connected legitimate marriage to honor and public status. Finally, in hostile language, a few of these authors asserted that celibacy laws originated with sodomite reformers, monks who cared little for a wife but preferred men. The accusation extends to even suggesting that reformers turned their heads at sodomy but openly pursued the dissolution of legitimate, clerical marriages. Their defense of clerical sons shows a deep knowledge of contemporary theology and an ability to employ the same arguments used by reformers to justify the existence of clerical sons.

In Normandy, the educated voices that spoke out in favor of clerical marriage were silenced at some point after the 1130s. By the mid-twelfth century, it was uniformly recognized that celibacy was the rule for clerics in major orders, and clerical marriage was no longer legally permitted. Clerical unions continued to exist far into the later Middle Ages but without the kind of vocal advocacy examined here. As the ideology of the manly celibate became the standard for male religious life, many secular clerics continued to live with their female partners and to create *de facto* marital unions, without any of the legitimacy they once enjoyed. This lack of legitimacy extended to their sons, men whose own ecclesiastical careers and masculine identities were jeopardized by celibacy laws. But these would not be the only challenges to the priesthood. In the thirteenth century, the pastoral revolution brought an expansion of the model of religious manliness, thereby increasing the restrictions on the priestly body. Additionally, this expansion was accompanied by a sophisticated administrative system that would allow a more effective enforcement of what would eventually become the manly priest ideology.

Chapter 5



“They ought to be a model and example”: The Expansion of Religious Manliness

We also enjoin that bishops as well as clergy take pains to be pleasing to God and to humans in both their interior and exterior comportment. Let them give no offence in the sight of those for whom they ought to be a model and example. . . . let them exhibit holiness. . . . We also decree that those in the orders of subdeacon and above who have taken wives or concubines are to be deprived of their position and ecclesiastical benefice. . . . it is unbecoming that they give themselves up to marriage and impurity.¹

Anglo-Norman clerical reform was almost exclusively devoted to the problems of clerical sexuality; measures against clerical marriage and clerical sons appeared in the conciliar canons produced in the eleventh and twelfth centuries because early reform efforts were focused on reconfiguring the priestly body as one of chaste virility. By the thirteenth century, however, sexualized chastity was no longer the only criterion establishing religious manliness. After 1215, the pastoral revolution² expanded these measures fully to reconceive the priestly body as one that was the epitome of self-control; clerical manliness required the control of bodily desire as always, but to be a man of the church required control of speech, display of proper attire, and deployment of a manly demeanor. This new emphasis could be traced back to the Lateran II canons (1139), but it was only in the thirteenth century that reformers in Normandy began pushing this expanded agenda, assisted by papal legates. Both the conciliar action and the sermons preached during this time illustrated a shift from the manly

celibate ideology to the manly priest model. Coded in the language of purity and impurity was the reformist initiative to delineate what standards of bodily comportment were appropriate for the priesthood.

The contest between ecclesiastical reformers and the clergy in the thirteenth century was played out on a different stage than the one that occurred in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, due to three significant events. First, the province of Normandy had been conquered by France in 1204, severing its polity and Church from England. Second, the papacy hosted what is arguably the most important church council in the West in 1215; Lateran IV promulgated many detailed canons related to clerical reform. Third, in concert with these reform canons, a legal apparatus was created to enforce these decrees. Whereas reforming bishops of earlier centuries had little ability to enforce their decrees on an unwilling clergy, the great canons of Lateran IV inserted mandates to ensure the creation of an administrative apparatus with which reform could be achieved. Lateran IV required every bishop to visit the parishes in his diocese at least once every three years and to hold a provincial synod yearly. Moreover, "in order that they may be able to exercise freely this office of correction and reform, we decree that no custom or appeal can impede the execution of their decisions." In this manner, the bishop was held responsible for the moral and spiritual regeneration of his clergy in his diocese.³ The reforming bishops of the thirteenth century now had at their disposal the means to impose the manly priest model on their clergy.

Yet Norman bishops were not always supportive of these initiatives to reform their clergy. After Normandy separated from England, the selection and appointment of its bishops was theoretically in the French king's power; Phillip Augustus, perhaps to gain the goodwill of the Norman prelates, generally left this control to the cathedral chapters.⁴ The bishops elected often tended to promote the interests, familial and political, of themselves and their cathedral clergy. Although formally severed from English ties, the Norman clergy continued to exhibit many of the same characteristics as their eleventh- and twelfth-century ancestors. Bishops of thirteenth-century Normandy still operated within their tight familial networks, promoting a policy of nepotism whenever it benefited them. If such conditions promoted a "continuity of policy," as one historian has suggested, reform would not come easily for the reforming archbishops who occupied the see of Rouen.⁵

Councils and Synods in Thirteenth-Century Normandy

Two most important changes in church governance occurred after 1200 in Normandy: a series of reforming archbishops, drawn from a variety of backgrounds (most outside Normandy), began in earnest the process of reform; as a result, provincial councils increased in frequency, and papal canons were disseminated by either legates or the archbishop of Rouen. Norman bishops had visible presences at ecumenical councils, indicating their sensitivity to and support of reform legislation. England continued the process of reform in the thirteenth century as well, with such notable bishops as Robert Grosseteste and Walter Cantilupe reforming their clergy with as much zeal as their Norman counterparts. Yet, although visitations records abound for England during this time, there are no records comparable to the detailed and systematic journal kept by archbishop Odo Rigaldus (1248–1275).⁶ This journal, when used with the other rich and varied documentary evidence from the archdiocese of Rouen, allows the historian to track the effects of the pastoral revolution on the parish clergy. These sources provide a unique opportunity to study the legislation of the manly priest model, as well as the effectiveness of such legislation.

In the twelfth century, Norman bishops held no regional councils between 1118 and 1190; the only ones held were summoned by papal legates (1128 and 1172). It is primarily for this reason that the Lateran II (1139) canons were likely not promulgated, until they were reissued at thirteenth-century diocesan councils. No Norman bishop attended Lateran III (1179), again an indication of the lack of support for papal legislation. Archbishop Walter of Coutances, newly translated from the see of Lincoln, began a long-term trend in the province by reinstituting the periodic synod in 1190. At the Council of Rouen, he passed over thirty canons, many based on Lateran II and III. Here he reaffirmed that a cleric was not allowed to keep a *focaria* in his home, that clerical sons could not serve the churches of their fathers, and that all clergy were forbidden to gamble and engage in secular business. Furthermore, he reemphasized the importance of the visual marker of religious manliness, the appropriately tonsured head.⁷

While Lateran II had reached beyond the regulation of clerical sexuality to include clerical comportment and appearance, it was not until the thirteenth century that these canons were increasingly emphasized by the archbishops of Rouen as they sought to reform the priestly body. The twelfth-century Renaissance had revived the classical emphasis on bodily comportment, and writers, drawing from their readings of Seneca and Cicero, explored the relationship

between the body's movements and somatic control to its inner character. Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141) asserted that "a speaker must have moderation (*modestiam*) in his gestures, such that, while he is speaking, his members do not move in a disordered, or immodest or extravagant fashion." Alain de Lille (d. 1203) in his *Summa de arte praedicatoria*, went even farther in linking overall bodily comportment to chastity. Chastity, he wrote, is made of "purity of spirit, innocence of body, spotless gesture (*munditia in gestu*), modesty in clothing, abstinence in nourishment and deference in speech. It is a salve to combat lust, which sullies the spirit, soils the whole body and loosens gesture (*laxat gestum*)."⁸ These concepts trickled into the conciliar discourse of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, where they contributed to the new, evolving standard of priestly masculinity spurred by the pastoral revolution. This renewed emphasis on bodily comportment and gesture arose from a host of societal changes, one of which was a delineation of social status; for the church, this was the crucial boundary between clergy and laity.⁹ Somatic control and appearance were the visual markers of clerical status. These markers, however, had a deeper significance for masculinity and bodily integrity, as the quote from Hugh of St. Victor illustrated. Laxity led to involvement with impurity, whether through seminal emissions, vomiting, drunkenness, or spilling of blood through violence. Thus, a priest or any cleric had not only to guard against the loss of sexual self-control but also to control his voice, movement, appearance, and overall behavior.

While all bishops drew their decrees from earlier councils, their selection of particular canons indicated the most pressing problems of clerical reform during their episcopate. In 1214, the papal legate Robert of Courson summoned a council at Rouen, one of many precursors to Lateran IV. The canons disseminated echoed the scholastic discourse on the clerical body, urging clerics to conduct themselves honorably, through appearance, comportment, and way of life.¹⁰ When Lateran IV was held a year later, the following amplified the standard for the priestly body:

In order that the morals and conduct of clerics may be reformed for the better, let all of them strive to live in a continent and chaste way . . . with a pure heart and an unsullied body. . . . All clerics should carefully abstain from gluttony and drunkenness . . . since drunkenness obscures the intellect and stirs up lust. . . ; Let them avoid taverns altogether . . . they should not play at games of chance or of dice . . . ; They should have a suitable crown and tonsure . . . ;

Their outer garments should be closed and neither too short nor too long. Let them not indulge in red or green cloths, long sleeves or shoes with embroidery or pointed toes.¹¹

Outer appearance and movement were inextricably tied to inner character. The archbishops of Rouen, as they held their own periodic synods and councils, reiterated these canons in various forms.

While archbishop Robert of Poulain (1208–1221) attended Lateran IV with some of his suffragan bishops, there is no indication that he himself summoned a council in the Norman province. However, his successor Thibaud d'Amiens (1222–1229), a Mendicant supporter, delivered nineteen canons from Lateran IV at his own Rouen council in 1224. The council included decrees prohibiting clerical fornication, gambling, drunkenness, and the practice of sons succeeding their fathers' churches; he also added that clerics should conduct themselves with an "honorable character."¹² Thibaud's episcopate was concerned with the reform of the priesthood, yet the archbishop had difficulty resolving the practical aspects of clerical discipline. The archbishop complained to Pope Honorius III that concubinary priests administered the sacraments in spite of their excommunication and that it was nearly impossible to send them all to Rome for absolution. The pope granted Thibaud the power to levy an appropriate penance instead.¹³

Maurice (1231–1235), a Benedictine monk and former bishop of Le Mans, succeeded Thibaud in 1231 and immediately held a council in which forty-nine canons were delivered to his clergy. Maurice's commitment to eradicating clerical fornication was so serious that he ordered a punishment specifically for the concubines of priests; should these women be unable to purge themselves of an accusation of concubinage, they would be brought to the church and have their hair shorn in front of the congregation, a punishment unparalleled in Norman history.¹⁴ Pierre Colmieu, a cleric with a long career of papal service, published his own statutes from 1238 to 1244; his contribution to reform included a renewed admonition regarding clerical comportment. He ordered that clerics should be moral examples to the laity: they should avoid fighting, dancing, and gambling. Additionally, clerics should not wear military style clothing and should always have a suitable tonsure. Colmieu's most curious decree included that any association with the laity, such as that defined above, not only degraded the authority of the priest but presented "bodily harm" (*periculum corporale*) to him as well.¹⁵ While his successor Odo Clement assisted Innocent IV at

the Council of Lyon in 1245, there was limited influence from that ecumenical council on the province of Normandy.¹⁶

Normandy found its most zealous reformer in the figure of Archbishop Odo Rigaldus. Odo is best known for his visitation register, which paints a vivid picture of his reform efforts in the province of Normandy. Yet he is also notable for presiding over seventy councils and synods, more than any other French bishop. The archbishop's goal was to reaffirm papal reform decrees in Normandy and disseminate them to the lowest level of the Church, the parish and its clergy. There was really nothing original about Odo's decrees; they were mostly derived from Lateran IV and the Council of Rouen (1231).¹⁷ What is notable is the archbishop's intensive effort to implement clerical discipline in his archdiocese. Odo decreed at a series of local and regional synods that clerics should have a suitable tonsure, should not wear inappropriate clothing, should not hunt, and should not participate in secular business; he reiterated previous canons on clerical concubinage, gambling, and tavern frequenting. His most effective success, however, was the use of archdeacons in local visitations. He selected archdeacons from his own household, which ensured that they were morally suitable investigators; he was also known for rotating them throughout the archdiocese, keeping them from forming bonds with the people over whom they governed.¹⁸

While Odo and his predecessors were invested in the process of ecclesiastical reform, it is not clear that his suffragan bishops were reform-minded. Odo's visitation record shows that he investigated the monasteries and cathedral chapters outside his diocese, the latter often considered a reflection of the bishop's household. A cathedral chapter rife with delinquent clerics signified an unconcerned bishop, and Odo admonished his suffragan bishops whenever clerical discipline was an issue. There was little to report from the visitations of the chapters of Avranches and Evreux, but the chapters at Bayeux, Coutances, Sées, and particularly Lisieux had multiple cases of lax discipline.¹⁹ While relations between the archbishop and his suffragans were initially cordial, Odo's use of archdeacons to investigate these chapters, along with his assertions that he could visit more than once every three years, led to a prolonged dispute with the other Norman bishops.²⁰ It is difficult to determine how the Norman bishops perceived reform, but there is no question that clerical fornication and other issues existed in their own cathedral chapters. William Pont de l'Arche, bishop of Lisieux, bestowed canonries on his nephews Ralph and Vincent. These men were noted twice in Odo's register, in 1249 and 1257, for conduct unfitting for

a cleric; they were accused of frequenting brothels and “running about town at night” armed with weapons.²¹ If the bishop’s own nephews were delinquent in their behavior, it is not difficult to imagine that other clerics in the chapter were similarly falling short of the reform ideal. Even in a diocese with reforming bishops, the challenge of implementing clerical discipline was sometimes insurmountable. Hugh, bishop of Coutances, lamented in a letter to Pope Gregory IX (1234) that not only did clerics take concubines publicly but simony and greed were alive and well among the parish clergy.²²

Through his regular visitations, his use of archdeacons, and his holding of synods, Odo attempted to reform the parish clergy in a manner unlike any of his predecessors and, quite possibly, any bishops of northern Europe; his visitations and synods are indicative of what Adam Davis has called a “micromanage-rial approach to governance.”²³ The process of visitation would ensure that errant clerics were monitored effectively and that candidates to the priesthood were scrutinized before ordination. Parish priests met with their deans monthly in a synod where they could be disciplined and also informed of the policies of church reform. At that time, major cases could be referred to the archbishop for prosecution. Odo was present at twenty-four of these monthly rural synods.²⁴ A synod had a wider agenda than a typical council; it would typically include prayer, Mass, promulgation of decrees, any necessary investigations into the state of the deanery/diocese, and a sermon. Synods were great educational events that could prepare priests for public prayer, the administration of the sacraments, and other general affairs of the diocese; they were held at the location of the episcopal seat and also “on the road” when bishops traveled to areas of the diocese.²⁵

Synods were unique opportunities for the bishops to deliver clerical instruction, to monitor clerical discipline, and to make known the decrees from greater councils. Synods included the preaching of a sermon, and it is through these documents that the archbishop’s ideas regarding clerical reform and the priestly body become most evident.

Odo Rigaldus and the Priestly Body

Preaching sermons was an integral part of clerical reform; bishops were expected to preach regularly to their clergy, not only to inspire them in their spiritual duties but also to reemphasize the importance of their own strong moral conduct. The subjects of sermons varied, and, while many were directed at all Christians, some

were specifically directed at bishops, priests, canons, and monks. While intended to instruct and inspire, these sermons also indicate the issues with clerical behavior that were most pressing at the turn of the thirteenth century. In this manner, *sermons ad clerum* were preached to reinforce reform canons.²⁶

The sermons Odo delivered at synods contained ideas about clerical manliness that were similar to those preached by earlier reformers with regard to the control of priestly sexuality and that reaffirmed the prohibitions on clerical behavior. His sermons suggest a concern not only for correcting errant clerical behavior but also for instructing priests to be diligent in their duties; this diligence for pastoral work should reflect one's inner devotion to the *cura animarum*. While control of sexual desire was important to clerical reform, Odo also broadened the ways purity and impurity were understood; the priestly body could be rendered impure not just sexually but also through other bodily appetites. Odo preached to secular clerics, especially to parish priests, a model of manliness that emphasized renewal of the male body, a spiritual transformation that incorporated orderliness, chastity, and controlled bodily comportment. The "new man" continually fought carnal desire, maintained sobriety, and presented his public figure through appropriate action and dress. In this manner, Odo's concepts were aligned with the Lateran canons and with renewed efforts to restrict the movements and behavior of the priestly body.

Odo's vision of religious manliness is present in a surviving collection of three synodal sermons, likely preached around the middle of the thirteenth century.²⁷ Since synodal sermons were delivered with the major goal of instruction, all three have a didactic quality to them. These sermons have strong similarities to each other, and all deliver essentially the same message: the priestly body exudes manliness through bodily self-control and also by diligent and sincere preaching. Odo's sermons spelled out the duties, responsibilities, and necessary qualities of priests in such a fashion that the figure of the disciplined, priestly body was created. The orderliness of his sermons, their organization, logic, and didactic function are all reflections of the archbishop's ideal masculine identity, created and re-created through writing and preaching such sermons. By its very appearance in Odo's sermons, the disciplined priestly body, controlled, orderly, and sanctified, created an anti-norm: the lax, gluttonous, libidinous, incapable, and uncontrolled. Clerical bodies such as these were not worthy of leadership because they could not exercise masculine self-governance. His audience of parish priests must have understood that serving the Church as a minister entailed a rigid and disciplined life of moral purity.

The first sermon in Odo's collection centered on the various manifestations of fidelity in the work of a priest, a quality emphasized in many sermons.²⁸ One way fidelity was expressed was through intention, but Odo lamented that few priests in his day pursued the *cura animarum* out of love for Christ, but instead sought material wealth. Odo reviewed the essential duties of the priest to God and his community. A priest must be trustworthy and should show his faithfulness to the church in six ways: fearing God, obeying God, acquiring knowledge and the dignity of the order, guarding souls, dispensing sacraments, and serving God.²⁹

Entrusted with these spiritual duties, a priest was charged with his household: his parish church. Odo, perhaps cognizant of his priests' behavior, designed a spiritual lineage that placed priests in the role of both spiritual "sons" and spiritual "fathers." Odo explained that God generated spiritual sons from "the womb of mother Church." These "sons" (priests) served God by performing the sacraments of penance and baptism.³⁰ Addressing the place of spiritual marriage, Odo preached that priests were the "offspring of Christ the king who married the daughter of the king, the parish."³¹ Within this context, Odo integrated his message of sexual restraint and replaced traditional marriage with a priestly equivalent. The faithfulness of priests to their spouses, that is, their parish churches, was expressed through their behavior. Because priests were spiritually "wed" to their parish churches, they must demonstrate faithfulness in that role. This fidelity was proven by three qualities and actions: "the abdication of desire, the meekness of humility and the restraint of chastity."³² Just as a priest had a filial duty to God, he had fatherly obligations to his "children," his spiritual offspring. Priests, as the Lord's servant, should not be quarrelsome or filled with pride, but kind to their spiritual children, governing and protecting them.³³ In this manner, priests manifested "faithfulness" through the cure and guardianship of souls.³⁴ But, instead of administering the sacraments, Odo lamented, many priests of his day were not "ministers" but "wasters" of the sacraments, spending excessively when they should be caring for the poor with alms.³⁵

Rather than generating spiritual children, fornicating priests polluted the sacraments, which achieved the opposite effect; such pollution barred the creation of spiritual children because priests who were suspended or excommunicated due to their sexual misconduct could not perform their duties.³⁶ Priests must guard their chastity, he argued, because they ministered daily at the altar. But many priests were not practicing the "restraint of chastity" (*continentia cas-*

titatis), the very “fidelity” that ought to exist in those who ascend to the altar. These priests polluted the altar in the same manner as those described in Zephaniah 3: 4, the prophets of Jerusalem who were unfaithful (*infideles*) men, and the priests who polluted the holy.³⁷ Odo revisited this theme in the next part of his sermon, while discussing the importance of the priest’s role in confession. The faithful and just city (community) is one which chooses its priest to judge sins in the parish. Yet, because of the poor examples of priests in his day, Odo asserted that the parish church, the priest’s “bride,” became effectively a “whore” (*scortum*), and, because the priests were themselves fornicators, they did not judge other fornicators.³⁸ By this analogy, Odo was able to connect clerical fornication to the destruction of the priestly body and the spiritual household. His message was clear: the integrity of priestly body affects the well-being of the parish community.

Odo’s second synodal sermon followed the same, general organizational scheme as the first sermon, but introduced some new themes. This sermon continued the didactic function, but emphasized different analogies and qualities of the priesthood. Odo preached that the ministry consisted essentially of four occupations. Priests were doctors, shepherds, farmers and architects.³⁹ The curing aspect of ministry came from dispensing the sacrament of confession, by which parishioners could be healed of their sins. The parish priest “feeds” his spiritual children by way of his preaching. He “cultivates” by his distribution of the sacrament of communion. And finally, he “builds” by being an example of holy living.⁴⁰ Priests became examples of holy living not only by their behavior but also by their outward appearance. The priestly body must be clothed in a certain way, because outward appearance affects inner character. Using the story of Aaron and his sons, Odo pointed out the special clothing required by God for the men to minister in the temple and serve the altar. These garments signified the chastity of the priests to the world. Returning to the examples from 1 Samuel (2: 18), the archbishop emphasized that Samuel ministered before God wearing a linen ephod, the same undergarment ordered by God in Exodus.⁴¹

In the same section, Odo raised the issue of polluting the sacraments, particularly the pollution of the body of Christ.⁴² Returning to the theme of fidelity, the archbishop once again emphasized that faithfulness was required to dispense the sacraments and honor God. Yet today’s priests, Odo argued, were prone to desires of the flesh and to simony, interested in the procurement of wealth, not the celebration of Mass, marriages, and the office of the dead.⁴³ Odo pointed out that such desires impede the distribution of sacraments; drawing

on the example of the sons of Eli, Odo preached that pleasure and lust (*luxuria*) introduce negligence.⁴⁴

While sacramental pollution appears in the first and second synodal sermons, in Odo's third synodal sermon the impact of impurity on the priestly body is defined. He preached that God ordered the purity of priests (*praeceptum illud est de sanctificatione sive munditia sacerdotum*), because priests "ascended" to God and "descended" to the people; priests occupied this sacred place of sacramental mediation, so their bodily purity was pivotal.⁴⁵ Impurity corrupted the priest's ability to perform his three most necessary duties: *curare* (to cure), *docere* (to teach), and *corrigere* (to correct). Priests "cured" through the sacraments, which acted as a medicine for the soul. Repeating a prior theme, he reiterated that impurity affected the priests' ability to administer these sacraments because sanctioned priests were barred from the altar. Priests must correct their parishioners' errant behavior, but drunken priests could not distinguish between the pure and impure. The sobriety of priests was necessary so that their reason would not be impaired.⁴⁶

Odo asserted that there were four bodily components which required purification so that priests could perform their duties. Purity was prescribed for the will, speech, loins and stomach (*affectionis, locutionis, renum et ventris*); these components, in their negative expressions, would result in a loss of self-control, and by extension, manliness. The impurity of all four barred the administration of the sacred offering. Odo provided further explanation of the impurity that could emerge from these functions if unguarded, and he supplemented his teachings with biblical examples of men who were struck down by the Lord for their unclean actions. Most of Odo's examples could be tied back to the dangers of fornication. The impurity of the heart was associated with the "depraved concupiscence of the will" (*in prava concupiscentia voluntatis*); to further illustrate his point, Odo asserted that a priest who touched the dead [a possible metaphor for sexually consorting with women?] gained nothing by his cleansing [receiving the sacrament]. He used the story of Alcimus from Maccabees (9: 54–56) to show how one who destroyed the works of the prophets was himself deprived of his speech. Odo's lesson here was that priests must guard against the uncleanness of speech, by avoiding the "vice of buffoonery" (*vitio scurrilitatis*) and "depraved suggestion" (*pravae suggestionis*). Just as a leper could infect others by his excessive panting, a priest's foul language could infect his parishioners.⁴⁷ And not only the parishioners. Like the Carolingian writers centuries before him, Odo suggested that an unrestrained tongue could corrupt the rest of the priestly body.⁴⁸ The

archbishop's use of Uzzah, from 2 Samuel, illustrated contamination of a holy vessel (the Ark of the Covenant) by sexual impurity. Through the emission of seminal flow, the loins were rendered impure; Odo warned that priests should guard against this impurity through correct dress. A clerical robe would not only contain and cover the loins, but would signify to the community the chaste status of the priest. The impurity of the stomach involved both gluttonous activity and inebriation. For that aspect, Odo used the story of the sons of Eli and their gluttony from the 1 Samuel (2: 12–17); by inebriation and gluttony, the priest became a degenerate.⁴⁹ This story was used a second time in the sermon, when the archbishop emphasized that the priests of his time were like Eli's sons, who slept with women at the door of the temple, while their father did little to prevent them (1 Sam. 2:22). His use of the same example here was intended not only to criticize the promiscuity of Norman priests, but to comment on the laxity of episcopal enforcement of celibacy laws. Drawing a direct parallel clearly aimed at his suffragan bishops, he commented that "it is terrible for the bishop to be negligent in correcting the *luxuria* of priests."⁵⁰

Like religious writers of earlier eras, Odo was concerned with the pollution of the sacrament; however, he emphasized this concept by preaching that priests could pollute their churches by their disorderly behavior, be it from excessive drinking or fornication. Odo cited Leviticus (10: 9–10), in which the Lord ordered Aaron and his sons to abstain from drinking alcohol before they entered the temple, so that they could discern the differences between the clean and unclean. Similarly, Odo explained, sobriety in priests was desired so that their judgment would not be in question; yet priests of his time violated God's law and polluted the sanctuary, not distinguishing between the holy and the unholy.⁵¹ The conclusions here are evident: drunkenness caused one to be unable to exercise reason and self-control. And, he reminded his clergy, "the priests, therefore, who come near to the LORD, must be sanctified from the uncleanness of thought, speech, the belly and the loins."⁵² These impurities threaten the sacred, mediating role of the priest.

Odo adapted his sermons, and his preaching of clerical manliness, to his audience. In 1265–66, he preached a sermon to students at the University of Paris.⁵³ While this sermon shares similar didactic elements with the synodal sermons, its chief theme was that of the "new man" and his role in the "new wars." This sermon shows that Odo was continuing the same themes as his predecessors in establishing a religious manliness that required the reform of the priestly body.

In his university sermon, he shifted from the major problems of the parish clergy (fornication and drunkenness) to what he saw as the major problems for young clerics about to be set free upon the world: fornication and greed. Recalling the story of Joseph who fled the adulterous overtures of Potiphar's wife, he emphasized that Joseph safeguarded his chastity at the cost of losing his beautiful coat. Citing Paul's famous admonition from the first letter to the Corinthians, Odo told the students to "Flee fornication." Both examples conveyed the idea that any involvement with the desires of the flesh would corrupt the soul, so carnal desire must be abandoned at any cost. Much like his example of the leper who infected others, Odo compared (sexual) pollution to a filthy man who would dirty anyone who touched him. Thus, the young students must avoid carnal temptation at all costs because the flesh pollutes whatever it touches.⁵⁴ He then offered to them the "purity" of spiritual marriage. The parish church as the "daughter of the king" was a "delicate and tender girl, rich and powerful and able to have the noblest bridegroom if she wished." But, according to Odo, the bridegroom (the priest) desires his worldly wife to Christ.⁵⁵

Like his predecessors, Odo emphasized that the ascetic body continually fights desires, so that the battle never ends, which affirmed an ongoing masculine performance. Odo relied on warrior imagery, as he emphasized the duty of Christians to fight in "new wars." Here he picked up the motif of the "new man," so amply employed in earlier reform rhetoric. He stated that there were wars that God did not like, caused by the problems of the world; these were wars fought to conserve worldly honor and to ensure protection.⁵⁶ Other causes of wars were to restore possessions and to defend one's own life. Odo acknowledged that protection of one's own life was reasonable, but wars should not be fought for evil causes and evil passions, nor for "villainy" or wickedness; these were the "old" battles.⁵⁷ There were new battles ongoing; these new battles to fight were just wars, the very ones that created the "new man." These men are "new" because, through Christ, they are "renewed."⁵⁸ Odo urged his young audience to become new men and "to fight manfully" (*qui viriliter pugnant*) against "the material world, the flesh and the Devil."⁵⁹

Odo advised his audience that they would face temptation and persecution from the Devil and laymen in the world. The Devil posed an ever present threat, in the form of sexual temptation. Odo preached that the Devil deceived humans by worldly things; men were captured easily by desires, just as a mouse is captured in a trap when lured by a dish of meat.⁶⁰ The flesh was the most serious enemy because it was an resident enemy, one that continually fought

against the spirit. Odo, using the story of Abraham's two sons, as retold by Paul in his letter to the Galatians,⁶¹ suggested that those born in the "ordinary" way would persecute those born by the power of God; perhaps understanding the social and gendered expectations of secular manliness, he preached to this audience that those who participate in the desires of the flesh (secular men) would persecute those chosen by God to lead the spiritual life (priests).⁶² Odo reminded them that public spectacles, material desires, and sexual temptations were ever present dangers outside the university. Some clerics may live in chastity while at the university but fall into carnal sin quickly on returning to their homeland. Thus, he admonished, the desires of the flesh must be renounced and chastity well guarded.⁶³ Odo's message elevated the "new man" above the old by emphasizing spiritual renewal and spiritual reproduction as higher degrees of manliness.

These sermons highlighted the most pressing problems of clerical reform for the Archbishop Odo Rigaldus. His sermons and synodal decrees are consistent with the pastoral revolution's emphasis on the extension of control and regulation of the priestly body—and the preaching body. This discourse not only required sexual purity but also prescribed specific duties and behaviors that placed limits on the movements and roles of priests. The priest's pastoral functions (to feed, to correct, to teach, to build, to cure, to cultivate) placed his body in a prescribed role designed to promote moral purity; as in earlier centuries, this model created an anti-norm. The priestly body did not reproduce biologically, did not make money through commerce and gambling, did not become drunk, did not engage in frivolous or scurrilous speech, did not create a biological family, and did not overeat. When combined with synodal decrees, these sermons presented a distinct religious masculinity, one set apart wholly from lay conceptions of manliness. The manly priest had been created in the form he would ideally embody until the Reformation era. It was now time for this model to be enforced on the parish clergy.

Chapter 6



Policing Priestly Bodies: The Conflict of Masculinities Among the Norman Parish Clergy

In an effort to further separate clergy from laity, the expanded manly priest model of the thirteenth century brought many modes of masculine behavior under the control of ecclesiastical reformers. Archbishop Odo Rigaldus's visit to the deanery of Brachy, on January 29, 1248, resulted in the following report:

We found the priest at Royville to be ill famed of incontinence with a stone-cutter's wife, who is said to have borne him a child; item, it is said that he has many other children; he is nonresident, plays ball, is nonresident [*sic*], and rides about in an open cape. . . . Item the priest at Venestanville is ill famed of incontinence with one of his parishioners, whose husband, as a result, has gone overseas; he has kept this woman for eight years and she is now pregnant; item, he plays dice and drinks too much; he haunts the taverns, does not keep adequate residence in his parish and rides his horse at will about the country. The penalty we have imposed on him is entered on folio 125.¹

From the perspective of the Church, these priests completely failed to attain a standard of religious manliness. But from the perspective of lay society, they acted like men, exhibiting sexual vigor, boldness, and physical prowess. They operated in a secular sphere, bonding with laymen, fighting their opponents, and projecting a public presence of might. In short, they positioned their bodies as ones that exuded secular manliness. By the thirteenth century, clerical culture

had partly adapted to ideals of ascetic manliness mandated in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, at least at the level of the elite clergy; bishops, archdeacons, and canons became the first group to assimilate almost wholly to church-defined religious masculinity. But the parish clergy were still largely unreformed. The evidence supplied by the register of Archbishop Odo Rigaldus illustrates that many parish clerics still practiced a gender identity that integrated them into a community of peers. They eschewed the religious manliness advocated by the church in favor of a secular manliness that gave them masculine status in their villages.

Disciplinary Methods

The legal developments of the thirteenth century allowed church reformers to enforce their standards of religious manliness on the priesthood. The priestly body became one that could be policed and prosecuted. The accusations made against the Norman parish clergy by *jurati* and/or parishioners were not always formal accusations; in many cases, rumors prompted an inquiry into the lifestyle of a cleric. Insinuations of errant behavior on the part of clerics were noted in Odo's register as either "ill fame" (*infamia*) or "defamed" (*diffamatus*). There has been some scholarly dispute over the specific definitions of these phrases.² It is evident that the archbishop employed "ill-fame" whenever there was suspicion of bad behavior and "defamed" whenever a priest was formally investigated or ordered to swear an oath. Medieval society was consciously aware of public reputation, and it factored importantly in terms of legal justice and public honor.³

Proceedings against errant clerics changed quite dramatically after a new development in criminal procedure was instituted by Innocent III. He, and before him Lucius III (1181–85), authorized the church courts to use a new procedure called *per notorium*. This procedure developed to simplify the criminal proceedings against priests who committed sexual transgressions. No accuser or formal accusation was required, and such proceedings did not require hard evidence of the crime. Convictions could be achieved, in theory, with only one witness and circumstantial evidence. An ecclesiastical judge could proceed against a defendant if there were any persons who would testify that they *believed* the defendant guilty; such "witnesses" did not have first-hand knowledge of the crime (such as viewing the priest kissing his partner) but might have heard a rumor concerning the offense. A judge could convict a priest, for example, if many in the parish believed the priest guilty of the crime. The procedure

per notorium was a dangerous weapon used against errant clergy, and it appears that it was designed for that particular purpose; after all, the stricter burden of proof required in other offenses would have prevented their convictions.⁴

Another new procedure introduced by Innocent III was *per inquisitionem*, which like, *per notorium*, lowered the burden of proof required for a conviction. This procedure allowed judges to initiate an investigation on their own, without any accusation, on the basis of public rumor. The judge was not required to produce a written complaint, and the defendant was often unaware that he was under investigation. The procedure placed the investigation of the crime and the conviction of it into the hands of one person: the judge. Defendants in these ecclesiastical criminal cases were not entitled to have a proctor, similar to an attorney, as their representative before the court.⁵

Clearly, many canonists and judges were uncomfortable using the procedure *per notorium*, and this may account for the use of canonical purgation (*purgatio canonica*) instead, a method of justice used in both secular cases and ecclesiastical criminal cases. The *purgatio canonica* had its origins in Germanic law and was later integrated into canon law. This procedure required the accused to provide proof of innocence. The accused did so by swearing an oath on the Gospels that he did not commit the offense imputed to him. He then produced a number of *compurgatores*, or compurgators (oath-swearers) to attest they believed the accused to be telling the truth. The compurgators did not function as eyewitnesses, nor did they swear to the facts of the case; they only swore they believed the oath of the accused to be honest. The compurgators selected by the accused had to meet certain requirements. The judge selected the number of compurgators required, which could range from five or more depending on the severity of the offense; the accused was then obliged to find that number of men who would swear by his oath. There were other restrictions, however, on the compurgators selected. These men had to be of good character (*fama*), acquaintances or neighbors of the accused, and most importantly for clerics, persons of the same social status; for canonical purgations involving priests, the compurgators had to be priests. If all the requirements for canonical purgation were met, then the accused was absolved of any wrongdoing. Yet, if the accused failed to swear the oath, or if the accused could not produce the required number of compurgators, then the crime was deemed proven, and the defendant declared guilty.⁶ Again, this process was intended to prove the legitimacy of accusations and, more specifically, the *fama* of the accused. If six compurgators, drawn from

the community of the accused, swore that the accused was telling the truth, then the accused did not have *mala fama*, or ill fame.

While Odo was known to remove errant clerics from their positions, he most frequently preferred a combination of fines and canonical purgation to discipline the Norman parish clergy. For canonical purgation, he often required the errant priest to bring seven members of his order as compurgators. Odo sometimes gave priests additional opportunities, if he believed they would not pass the purgation. For instance, when the priest at Chartier appeared for his compurgation, (after having been accused of sexual indiscretions with Germaine d'Asnières), with seven unsuitable priests who did not know him well, Odo allowed him to try again; for the next purgation, he required him to bring six priests of good repute (*bone fame*) who knew him well.⁷ Odo did sometimes require more than seven compurgators, but only for the most serious and flagrant abuses. Amauricus, the priest at Courdimanche, was ordered to undergo canonical purgation with the *twelfth* hand of priests (meaning he had to produce twelve compurgators who were priests), for crimes not listed in Odo's register. Amauricus attempted to appeal this order, citing that twelve compurgators was excessive and that, by requiring it, the archbishop infringed on his rights.⁸

Most often, Odo wanted the oaths of his errant clergy documented by way of the *diffamationes*, letters of defamation, which he appended to his register.⁹ *Diffamationes* were written equivalents of sworn oaths. The errant cleric would submit such a letter to Odo, written and sealed in front of witnesses. Often, the letter bound the cleric to agree to the will of the archbishop in the matter of the defamation. In terms of style, these letters were very formulaic and do not provide scholars with the authentic voices of the priests. The general pattern of the letters began with the cleric acknowledging the accusation, and concluded with an agreement to resign his church in the future if again accused and unable to purge himself canonically. The vast majority of the letters of defamation in Odo's register, which total ninety, involve secular clerics accused of sexual crimes (concubinage or fornication); other letters from errant clerics concern drinking, failure to proceed to Holy Orders, and fighting. Only three of these *diffamationes* are from regular (monastic) clergy.¹⁰ The *diffamationes* did not prevent further errant behavior, but they did serve as public recognitions of such behavior; as oaths sworn in the presence of the archbishop or his representative and documented in a register, these letters forced the errant

priest to acknowledge his behavior was incompatible with his vocation as a man of the Church.

Instead of canonical purgation, but sometimes in combination with it, Odo also levied fines. This system of discipline forced the priest to maintain his self-control, lest he be forced to pay a substantial portion of his yearly wage. Fines were used both as a deterrent against future crimes and also as a punishment for current offenses. For example, the priest at Virville was known for drunkenness, so the archbishop ordered the priest of a neighboring parish to collect 5 *solidos* every time the priest became inebriated and, in addition, every time he entered a tavern.¹¹ This was a relatively small fine to pay in comparison to the clerics placed under suspicion of sexual misconduct. The priest Walter of Guillerville was ordered to pay ten *livres* for adultery with the wife of Henry Tabare, while another priest, Henry of Gomerville, was obliged to pay twenty *livres* if found again with the daughter of the dean. Walter of Guillerville's parish church drew an annual income of 30 *livres*, while the church at Gomerville drew forty *livres*.¹² Stephan, priest at Denanstanville, was given two options for his alleged indiscretions with the daughter of Robert Pesant; either pay a 20 *livre* fine (his parish church was worth 50 *livres*) or else purge himself by the seventh hand of priests.¹³ As indicated by these examples, fines could range from 30 to 50 percent of the value of the benefice. While such penalties could be abused and molded into a license to misbehave, Odo's intention seems to have been a quick end to the illicit behavior of the cleric through financial penalties.

For recalcitrant priests, Odo would levy suspension until a hearing had been held. However, this sort of discipline left the church vacant and posed serious problems for parishioners who had no curate and no access to the sacraments. For some cases involving sexual indiscretions, especially with a priest's own female parishioners, Odo would order the priest to exchange his church with one in another parish or even diocese. This method of discipline might have prevented reoccurrence of adultery and concubinage with the same women, because the priest had been removed from the immediate area. It also immediately ended the scandal in that particular parish community. Peter, curate at Hardvillier, was accused of indiscretions with his parishioner Richeudi, widow of Girelmi. On the instruction of the archbishop, he exchanged his church with one at Bionval and promised that, if he again suspected of such indiscretions, he would resign his church.¹⁴ In 1263, Reginald, rector at Lyntot, was given until Easter to exchange his church for another. The priest had been defamed of incontinence in 1258 and had submitted a letter of defamation promising to

resign if he were to offend again. Odo gave this curate another opportunity, yet for unknown reasons Reginald resigned.¹⁵

Although the bishop had the power to excommunicate recalcitrant priests, it was not an effective disciplinary tool. Excommunication might invoke fear in some errant priests, but theoretically it prevented the priest from performing his duties. In many cases, the priest continued to serve the altar, in spite of suspension and/or excommunication. If the errant priest resigned, parishioners were deprived of the sacraments until the bishop could find a substitute. As an alternative form of discipline, the bishop might mandate that the accused undertake a pilgrimage to Rome as penance. Odo reserved this penalty for cases when he believed the priest to be truly repentant, but this method of discipline did not always produce a reformed priest. Walter, rector at Biville, came under suspicion for sexual indiscretions *after* his return from Rome and was ordered to undergo canonical purgation.¹⁶ In another case, the parishioners from the village of Gonnetot believed their priest to be involved with two women. Odo sent the priest "to the Pope" and when the priest returned, he "relapsed" with another woman from the village of Waltot.¹⁷

Odo Rigaldus's efforts were met with both submission and resistance on the part of those priests who were the object of reform. Despite the formulaic nature of the documents, patterns emerge concerning Odo's attempts to reform through the ecclesiastical methods of discipline. The procedure *per notorium* and *per inquisitionem* allowed the archbishop ample power to discipline and even remove errant priests from office. Yet Odo allowed many chances for a misbehaving priest to reform his ways. This leniency was not due to lack of proof of the offense, but perhaps was derived from a more practical problem: lack of suitable replacements for the errant curates. The sources from thirteenth-century Normandy suggest there was a shortage of priests and that this problem had already been acknowledged by the papacy earlier in the century. After the Constitutions of Gallo (1208), concubinary priests were subject to excommunication, a measure that effectively barred them from the ministry; furthermore, the errant priests could only be absolved by the papal legate or the pope, not by their own bishop. Thibaud d'Amiens, archbishop of Rouen (1222–1229), suggested in a letter to Pope Honorius III that sending concubinary priests to Rome was not possible; there were too many of them and there were no replacements.¹⁸ Councils from the early thirteenth century also indicate that there was a problem with staffing all parishes and that sometimes priests from outside the diocese were hired to minister. Both the councils of Paris

(1212) and Rouen (1214) condemned the practice of bishops, who contracted “priests-for-hire” to preach for a length of time in a parish.¹⁹ Additionally, while parish clerics came from a wide range of social strata, many were drawn from the lower aristocracy. Thus powerful patrons and influential families may have played a role in preventing their curate’s removal from office.

Perhaps the shortage of suitable clerics in Normandy prompted Odo Rigaldus to keep “bad” priests, allowing them numerous chances to reform themselves. The following cases speak to this theory. They demonstrate that Odo tried to reform some of the worst offenders multiple times, even though he had the legal power to remove them from office.

Sexual Suspicion and the Priestly Body

The archbishop handled many cases of sexual suspicion and, by extension, sexual scandal as he embarked on reform. Ecclesiastical reformers were successful in reforming the elite clergy by the mid-thirteenth century in Normandy and England, as bishops had long ceased to practice marriage or concubinage. Celibacy among parish clergy, however, was harder to mandate due to the entrenched nature of marriage among the Norman priesthood. Odo’s register notes numerous cases where priests were cited for suspicion of sexual misbehavior. The degree of proof is not conclusively known for the vast majority of these cases. A priest may have been guilty of concubinage or adultery, or he may have been the victim of gossip. What these cases do indicate is that by way of episcopal sanction Odo sought to eradicate all sexual scandal. A priest rumored of sexual scandal lost his ability to be a leader of a spiritual community. Essentially, he could no longer be “father” to his spiritual “children” if he lost his chaste manliness, at least in the eyes of ecclesiastical reformers. While the language of legal discourse had changed, with these unions described as cases of clerical “incontinence” (*incontinencia*), the local perceptions of these unions may not have. What reformers had defined as effeminacy, demonstrated by an excessive love of women and sex, these clerics potentially used as a social demonstration of manliness.

The cases of sexual misbehavior reported range from concubinage to simple fornication with one or more women. Many priests who appear in Odo’s register for disciplinary sanction were men who were rumored to be involved in long-term, quasi-marital relationships. These relationships were the very ones that made priests vulnerable to censure and retaliation from their enemies who

could use their illicit, but publicly well known union as a threat against them. For this reason, some priests kept their concubines outside their parish, in neighboring villages and towns where their clerical identity might be less well known. Although not all priests' lovers were described as concubines, many were women in long-term unions that a century earlier might have been termed marriage.²⁰ The study of clerical concubines suffers from a lack of source material; in Odo's register, most of these women are mentioned not by name but by their most common labels: *focaria*, *pediseca*, *concubina*.²¹ In many cases, priests continued to carry on their relationships, even after a warning by the dean, archdeacon, or bishop. The priest at La Rue St. Pierre, in the deanery of Cailly, kept his entire family in his home; he was disciplined by the archdeacon for keeping a *vetula* (little old woman) for a long time and for keeping his son and daughter at home with them.²² One such priest from Bazinval, already disciplined by the archdeacon, continued to see his concubine, even taking her out in public to the market.²³ The priest at Foucarmont was also suspected of concubinage, for, although he was publicly known for his relationship and had been disciplined, he had already relapsed with the *vetula*.²⁴ In August 1257, Girard, the priest at Martigny, appeared before the archbishop and confessed that he had kept Mathilda, one of his own parishioners, for three years.²⁵ The archbishop disciplined Stephen, priest at Commeny, in 1254 for concubinage; Stephen had given up his partner, with whom he had children, and submitted a letter to that fact. Despite these efforts, he confessed to a "relapse"; when Odo ordered the priest to resign, Stephen asked for a hearing and was suspended until then.²⁶ Six months later, he was deprived of his church because he had been ordered to stand trial and did not appear.²⁷ The priest at Brachy had a concubine, but for some unknown reason she had forsaken his home; he had all his food carried to her house so he could dine with her there.²⁸ These unions were clearly *de facto* marriages; more than a hundred years after clerical marriage was banned, some localities still found these unions permissible.

Despite warnings, many priests continued these relationships for a long time, even after suspension and excommunication. The priest from Courdimanche retained his concubine and continued to celebrate Mass while under suspension.²⁹ Nicholas, priest at Giverny, had been excommunicated for many years because of his relationship with a woman from Rouen; in 1251, he submitted a letter of defamation concerning his sexual misconduct.³⁰ William, priest at Notre Dame, had been publicly known for incontinence for twenty years with one woman before Odo suspended him until further proceedings.³¹

Geoffroi, priest at Val-du-Roi, was disciplined three to four times for illicit sexual behavior, yet he “relapsed” in 1248.³² In January 1258, Geoffroi was rumored to be sexually involved with a woman from Gamaches. The dean was ordered to investigate.³³ These cases raise the question of effective discipline, as well as community acceptance of clerical concubinage. Since priests were ill famed on reports from their villages, it would seem some parishioners did not approve of these unions. Yet their continued existence would illustrate the contrary. At the very least, disciplinary tactics were not so formidable that a priest was easily convinced to forsake his partner.

Would medieval priests have hid away their families in neighboring villages or flaunted them in their own? It appears they did both. Evidence suggests that priests carried on sexual unions with women not living in their immediate village but in neighboring parishes, sometimes a great distance away. Renaud, the rector from Freauville, confessed to consorting with a woman living at Pomereval, a village approximately fifteen miles away.³⁴ The priest at Sauchy-aubosc had one partner in the parish of Berengeville and another in the parish of Coqueraumont, for which he was suspended. Even so, he was still celebrating Mass.³⁵ Geoffroi, the priest at Vanchy-sur-Eaune, was rumored to be involved with a widow from Rouen, approximately fifty miles away; he also had a child by her.³⁶ These men may have had local ties to these communities, but keeping a concubine in another village or town may have also protected the cleric’s family.

Also notable is that many of these Norman priests continued serving their churches even after suspension and excommunication. This fact, along with resumption of clerical unions even after sanctions, questions the effectiveness of episcopal discipline. In some cases, clerics removed from office displayed contempt for the archbishop’s authority, which suggests they might have come from a higher social status. The case of Walter, rector of the church at Aronville, is unique for it allows the medieval scholar to understand the anger and resentment of an accused priest. The parish of Aronville, in the deanery of Chaumont-en-Vexin was under the patronage of the abbot of Pontoise. Walter’s name does not appear in the census for the parish, but there is a noticeable gap between the institution of the first priest, Bartholomew, by the archbishop Robert (1208–1221), and the institution of another priest, Nicholas, by Odo Rigaldus sometime during his episcopacy.³⁷ Walter’s case provides some insight into how the process of reform actually worked, especially that of canonical purgation. Canonical purgation has been criticized as an easy way to escape

punishment.³⁸ Yet Walter's case clearly shows that it was not, and that the archbishop could remove priests at will, without due process.

On October 25, 1261, Walter appeared before the archbishop to answer charges of sexual misconduct. He did not deny the charges, and he was assigned a day for canonical purgation with the seventh hand of priests.³⁹ Two months later, on December 19, 1261, he appeared for his canonical purgation, but without the required witnesses. He told the archbishop he could not find enough priests to serve as compurgators for him, due to the approaching holy days. While Odo suspected Walter was being dishonest, he postponed Walter's purgation until another day.⁴⁰

Four months later, in April, Walter had his second chance but failed his compurgation; Odo did not note if Walter had even appeared in person. The archbishop announced that, because Walter had been seriously defamed of sexual incontinence both in and outside his parish and had failed canonical purgation, he was deprived of his church benefice.⁴¹ Seven days later, Walter sent a proctor, Simon from the diocese of Beauvais, to serve as his messenger, enter his appeal, and negotiate on his behalf. Walter's appeal was read by Simon to the archbishop and expresses Walter's sentiments forthrightly.

First, Simon, in his introduction, accused the archbishop of proceeding against Walter "wickedly and unjustly" (*inique . . . iniuste*). His first point was that Walter was denied a lawyer by the officiality (church court). His request for the investigative documents was also denied by the archbishop.⁴² In addition to these procedural errors, Walter said that all accusations of the *infamia* came from rumor and gossip, from "some malicious and slanderous persons" (*quibusdam malivolis et maledicis*) and not by "honest and honorable men" (*non a viris providis et honestis*).⁴³ Walter also claimed he was never asked to be present at the inquiry.⁴⁴ Simon told the archbishop that Walter had never been previously defamed in his own parish in the last twenty years, and the proctor insinuated that Odo had initiated such an investigation from "a foreign place"; thus he had not sufficiently investigated the "crime" but had relied on scandalous gossip to proceed against the priest. Simon stated that no one had accused the priest of any crime, and no accusers were present currently. He stated that, although Walter had been defamed of illicit sexual conduct with a woman and was rumored "to have loved her greatly" (*adamabat*), it was not true, and he was willing to prove he would give up this woman completely.⁴⁵ Walter was ready to submit to a hearing in which the priests and parishioners of his deanery were present and able to testify to his character, but instead, the proctor claimed, the arch-

bishop made inquiries of witnesses “strangers and unknown persons” (*extraneos et . . . ignotos*) in far and remote places. Walter had requested the archbishop question his parishioners concerning his “life, honor and character” (*vita, honestate, moribus*). Odo, however, had refused, and again the proctor mentioned the use of testimony from “unknown persons.”

By way of his proxy, Walter also indicated what process and outcome he thought would be fair. He was willing to submit a letter of defamation, in which he agreed to resign if he should be defamed again. Yet the archbishop was unwilling to allow this. Walter did not think canonical purgation was a reasonable alternative, pointing to a serious problem with the use of this procedure. He lived more than twenty leagues from Rouen, and it was difficult for him to find other priests who would travel for his purgation. Complicating this matter, he argued, was the number of compurgators required; seven men were difficult to find, especially when five or fewer would have been enough for justice. Knowing Walter would find no sympathetic ears among officials at Rouen, Simon formally stated he would launch an appeal with the Holy See concerning the deprivation of Walter’s benefice.⁴⁶

The archbishop’s response to Walter’s letter by proxy was simple and to the point: “In as much as this appeal contained neither just nor true reasons, we were in no way obliged to defer to it.”⁴⁷ If Walter was innocent of this crime, then it aptly illustrates how the archbishop had broad powers to remove clerics quickly with little concrete evidence, and how the newer canonical procedures allowed the archbishop to conceal any witnesses against the priest. This stands in stark contrast to the environment of the late twelfth century, when sufficient evidence was needed to remove clerics who created scandal. If Walter was indeed guilty of this crime, and there are such indicators in his proxy letter, then his willingness to have his own parishioners questioned makes a bold statement concerning the public acceptance of such unions. The proxy letter stated that Walter was known “to have loved her greatly,” a statement that indicates a relationship more significant than a casual affair. The statement made by the proxy, that Walter “offered to prove in your [Odo’s] presence that he was prepared and willing to adjure her completely and wholly,” also suggests a deeper relationship.⁴⁸ Yet Walter encouraged the archbishop to question the people of his parish, along with neighboring priests, to determine his innocence. This suggests confidence on the part of this priest, a knowledge that his community would support him in this inquiry.

There is strong evidence to suggest that parishioners of rural communities

were little bothered by concubinous priests, so long as church services were maintained and not neglected. Parishioners may have preferred that their priests have their own women; it meant that the wives and daughters of the village were protected, at least theoretically, from the sexual advances of the local curate. Odo's register shows evidence that priests could be sexually suspected of illicit affairs with married women from all social ranks. Priests were linked to affairs with the wives of bakers, stonecutters, squires, knights, carpenters, and other (minor) clerics. The priest at Royville, among other accusations, was rumored to be sexually involved with a stonecutter's wife and reportedly had a child with her.⁴⁹ Giles, the chaplain at Ivry-le-Temple, was cited for sexual incontinence with the wife of Garner the carpenter.⁵⁰ The priests at Venestanville and Longueil were associated with the wives of absent men. The priest from Venestanville was rumored to have had an affair with a man's wife for eight years while the man was overseas; the wife was pregnant with the priest's child.⁵¹ Laurence, priest at Longueil, also had a child from an adulterous union with Beatrice Valeran, while her husband was outside the province.⁵² Some clerics were still tied to former lovers they knew before acquiring a benefice. The priest from Saint-Laurent-le-Petit was accused of incontinence in 1258 and ordered to stay away from the married woman he had known before becoming a priest.⁵³ As a group, parish priests were always sexually suspect when it came to the married women of their communities.

Odo's concern over adultery perhaps exceeded his concern over concubinage, for sexual rivalries could lead to violence resulting in a double impurity: the pollution of the priestly body by sex and bloodshed. From the priest's perspective, sexually conquering another man's wife might have been a way to assert superior virility and dishonor a rival. At Ecretteville, Henri, the village priest, was caught in a compromising position on Palm Sunday in 1252. Robert de Bosc discovered Henri in his bushes one night, and they engaged in a brawl; Henri was rumored to be sexually involved with Robert's wife.⁵⁴ He submitted a *diffimatio*, which stated:

To all who view this, Henri, priest of Ecretteville, greetings in the Lord. Be it known that when the venerable father O.[do], by the grace of God, archbishop of Rouen, visiting the archdeaconate of the Major Caux, found me seriously defamed of the wife of Robert de Bosc, my parishioner, I willingly obligated myself to him that if I shall be defamed of the vice of incontinence again, and I cannot

canonically purge myself for this, I from then on, will resign from my church. In whose testimony I present this letter sealed by my seal and the seal of the dean of Fauville.⁵⁵

Priests' adulterous relationships with their female parishioners could be gossip fiction or an authentically real relationship that threatened the order and stability of the parish community. Even the most well-meaning cleric must have faced some sort of social isolation from his vow of (chaste) celibacy, which would leave him outside the familial, household relationships he witnessed everyday. The case of Roger de Sorenc, rector of the church at Limésy, demonstrates the possible dilemma faced by men entering Holy Orders. Some clerics may have been conflicted over entering the major orders that required a vow of celibacy, even to the point of delaying ordination until a benefice was firmly secured. This was a practice Patricia Cullum has found for late medieval England.⁵⁶ Roger first appears in Odo's register as early as June 1253, when he was ordered by the archbishop to proceed to the major orders of subdeacon, deacon, and priest, all ranks that required a vow of celibacy under canon law.⁵⁷ Because Roger already held a benefice, Odo threatened to deprive him of it unless he was ordained to the priesthood in a timely fashion.⁵⁸ Roger swore an oath to do so or to resign his church.⁵⁹ Yet he did not enter the major orders as he promised, and in February 1254 he was summoned before the archbishop to make amends for not being ordained. Roger was ordered to pay a stiff fine of 40 *livres* (his church drew an annual income of 80 *livres*) or face legal proceedings. The question remains: why had Roger, who had already acquired a church benefice, not proceeded to the major orders, especially after swearing an oath to do so? Given that he was in a position as parson of a parish church, he could not, by canon law, administer the sacraments until he proceeded to the minimum rank of subdeacon.⁶⁰

Quite possibly, Roger did not enter major orders because he would have been obliged by the required vow of celibacy. He did in fact proceed to the rank of priest, because in 1260 he submitted a letter of defamation as presbyter of the church at Limésy. In his letter, he stated that he was accused of sex with Mathilda "Grandi" the wife of another (presumably minor) cleric, Peter of Vicquemare.⁶¹ Odo noted on January 15, 1260, that Roger had been suspended *pro contumacia* (by default) because he had not appeared on a previously appointed day for the inquiry. Roger did in fact confess to the rumor of sexual incontinence, but said it had desisted for a month. He appeared again four days

later for a full investigation, and was ordered to undergo canonical purgation after Ash Wednesday. Roger's defamation was considered serious enough for canonical purgation with ten compurgators from the order of the priesthood.⁶² Roger's own letter stated he would abide by the required canonical purgation and give up his church if accused again.⁶³ Roger of Sorenc did not appear again in Odo's register. It is likely, however, that he was unable to purge himself and was forced to resign, because Odo later replaced him with another priest.⁶⁴

While we cannot ascertain the guilt or innocence of Roger of Sorenc, we can surmise that his supposed affair caused enough scandal and posed enough of a threat to the community for the archbishop to order such an unusually large number of compurgators. In such cases where large numbers of compurgators were required, the archbishop likely knew that the priest was guilty but wanted to extend the benefit of the doubt. On other occasions, the archbishop used his ability to send away the errant cleric to another diocese or to Rome. It appears Odo made use of this sort of discipline whenever there was sufficient evidence of a scandal. In the eyes of church authorities, adultery, like concubinage, scandalized the community.

One method to end this kind of scandal was to remove the source, either the priest or the adulterous wife, by the exchange of churches; this solution would have likely pacified powerful patrons more than a resignation of the office. Radulph de Neuburg, rector at Sommersy, was cited for sexual incontinence many times with a woman from Neuburg; the charge was so serious that he was ordered to exchange his church with one in another *diocese*.⁶⁵ Luca, the priest of Saint-Nicholas-de-Rouen, was ordered to exchange his church for another outside Rouen, for his adultery with Jeanne, a married parishioner.⁶⁶ Likewise, Olivier, the rector of Toqueville, was deprived of his church for adultery with Avivia, his parishioner. He had promised to resign unless he could exchange his church, but he failed and was deprived.⁶⁷ In a rather unusual case, the priest from Bosc-Robert was not ordered to leave town because of his adultery; instead, the archbishop ordered the priest to send away the woman and her husband, in addition to another girl.⁶⁸ Florent, rector at Lymezy, was granted leniency when he appeared before the archbishop and confessed to adultery with a parishioner; he was subsequently ordered to go to Rome on pilgrimage and bring back proof of his trip.⁶⁹

Undoubtedly, many of these men did not cease their affairs quietly. The case of Thomas Houffroy, a cleric from Vinemerville, demonstrates that Church administrators may have feared the anger of the displaced cleric. In January 1260,

Thomas appeared and put up a bond of twenty *livres* as a guarantee that he would give up Valentina, the wife of William Trenchant, his relative. Fifteen months later, he was again accused of relations with Valentina, despite his oath to abjure her and his financial guarantee.⁷⁰ He was assigned a day for canonical purgation. Yet, when his day in court arrived, the archdeacon Peter de Ons feared the wrath of Thomas Houffroy so seriously that he, unwilling to pardon him, ordered him to leave the area for two years and study in Paris or elsewhere.⁷¹ In June 1265, Thomas appeared again before the archdeacon to purge himself with seven compurgators because he had relapsed with Valentina. On the day assigned, he appeared and agreed to leave the village for a year and to pay a penalty of ten *livres* if he entered it within that time.⁷² For over four years, Thomas Houffroy had carried on an affair with his relative's wife, even after multiple interventions by the archbishop's men.

In addition to their associations with concubines and married women, priests who frequented brothels or associated with prostitutes brought scandal into their communities and threatened the purity of the clerical body. Lay society might have consented to the use of prostitutes by the clergy, in an effort to keep these men away from their own wives and daughters.⁷³ There is evidence of such clerics in Odo's register. One particular priest at Quित्रy left town to visit a brothel in the neighboring village of Les Andelys; his identity was discovered when he was robbed there.⁷⁴ Walter, from Bray-sous-Baudemont, slept with a prostitute and later assaulted her. He was known to many prostitutes, having officiated at one's wedding, even leading the marriage dance. Walter confessed he had "known" this prostitute, as had the priests in the neighboring villages.⁷⁵

Priests who were associated with sexual scandal publicly presented the figure of a disorderly, sexualized body, the anti-norm to the elevated, ordered, and controlled priestly body desired by ecclesiastical reformers. Many of these priests may not have been guilty, but were the victims of gossip or vengeful retaliation from those in their communities. Nonetheless, association with sexual scandal called into question their priestly authority, their self-control, their mastery over themselves and their communities; at the same time, sexual scandal may have established their bodies as virile and manly, much like the men of their villages.

The Scandalous Body

In trying to stabilize the priestly body and transform it into one of celibate manliness, reformers removed traditional markers of masculinity in Norman society. In refining this model, they further tightened the standard of bodily comportment. Odo's presentation of the ordered, self-controlled priestly body in his sermons found its antithesis in the actions and behavior of the Norman parish clergy. Arguably, cloistered monks who lived the authentic ascetic life did not lose the camaraderie and male friendship within their communities. But the imposition of religious manliness on the secular clergy threatened to cut them off from all means of social male bonding. Not only did they lose the ability to govern a household, take a wife, and produce heirs, they were also cut off from the broader male culture of their towns and villages. In his register, the archbishop noted that priests were hunting, fowling, drinking excessively, gambling, and frequenting taverns; priests were engaged in physically aggressive and violent behavior. On the broadest level, they were transgressing the boundaries between the lay and clerical spheres. When examining the disorderly behavior of these men, one pattern stands out: many of the priests who were accused of sexual scandal were also involved in other forbidden acts.

The excessive drinking or inebriation of Norman clerics was a concern because, as Odo had preached in his sermons, such behavior rendered one unable to discern between holy and unholy behavior. The church's concern with excessive drinking was explicitly linked to the control of the libido, which made intoxication a threat to the purity of the priestly body; it also led to physical laxity, a relaxed demeanor, and sometimes acts of violence. But there was an additional concern related to drinking; clerics entered taverns to drink, and there they socialized with laymen. The village tavern represented virtually everything at odds with the purity of the priestly body. Men drank to excess and vomited. They corrupted themselves by gambling and losing money (and sometimes their clothes); they brawled, they bled, and they interacted with women of questionable honor. The actions that occurred inside this masculine social space ran counter to the religious model of order, reason, and comportment.⁷⁶ But from the perspective of laymen, the tavern was a remote getaway, an equalizing space, where every man could participate, regardless of social status (and vocation). It provided a sense of disconnectedness from the rest of society, if only for a brief moment.⁷⁷ Perhaps this was a prevailing reason that clerics enjoyed this space, in spite of prohibitions ordering them to abstain from such

places. Male camaraderie was gained while bodily purity lost.⁷⁸ Drinking in a tavern sometimes could develop into a competition among men, from the quest to consume the greatest amount of alcohol to the ability to pay for many drinks. Canon 15 of Lateran IV particularly noted the competitive aspect of alcohol consumption, stating “that man is most praised who makes the most people drunk and himself drains the deepest cup.”⁷⁹ Gambling was another danger to clerical comportment.⁸⁰ The Church’s opposition to gambling was most likely rooted in the location (tavern), as well as the violence and financial loss that could occur from such activity. Excessive gambling losses could force a cleric to despoil his parish church of valuables to pay off debts, or even to sacrifice his clothing, a valuable commodity. Cheating was more common in dice playing than other games, and conflicts could quickly degenerate into violence.⁸¹ Dice were also used in fortune telling, and church prohibitions against the use of dice were also directed toward preventing its clergy from engaging in magic.⁸² Gambling was thus tied to production of a disorderly male body, but not in the same manner as excessive drinking.

Many of the priests disciplined by Odo were not just engaged in sexual relationships; they were also defiling the priestly body by a wide range of disorderly, immoderate actions. But these very actions allowed them moments of male bonding and acceptance into a community of their peers. Odo visited the collegiate chapter Saint Mary’s of Sauqueville seven times over the course of sixteen years. In August of 1251, Odo noted that the treasurer of the chapter (and a parish priest), Ferric, was rumored to be involved with Alice of Garennes; in addition, Ferric had been “running about town” (*incedit per villam*) wearing inappropriate clothes.⁸³ Ferric responded with a letter to the archbishop, promising to abstain from such behavior and to pay a fine if accused again.⁸⁴ Odo also noted that Master Walter, another canon, was publicly known for frequenting taverns, playing dice, and fornicating.⁸⁵ By August 1252, it appeared that Ferric and Master Walter were not simply one-time offenders. That year Odo noted that both men were frequenting taverns and that Walter was still gambling. Neither man was performing his designated function for the chapter, yet both were receiving a portion of the “commons,” the communal food supply.⁸⁶ A report from March 1254 states that Ferric and Walter were still frequenting taverns.⁸⁷ These reports continued over the next several years, until eventually in 1257 the archbishop seized their incomes.⁸⁸

Given his view that drunkenness encouraged laxity and an inability to discern between the pure and impure, this kind of behavior posed a great problem

for the archbishop. This may have been the problem for Richard, the priest at Yebleron, who neglected the canonical hours in favor of spending more time in the taverns; he was also rumored of sexual incontinence and "running about the country" (*discurrit per patriam*). Odo forbade him to enter a tavern within a league of Yebleron. Richard pledged to the archdeacon he would not frequent taverns; if he did, he agreed to pay a fine.⁸⁹ Odo's register also confirms the active participation of the clergy in gambling; usually these offenses occurred in the context of other secular male behavior. The priest at Ecotigny, in addition to his sexual adventures, was frequenting taverns and playing dice and quoits, after he had already been disciplined by the archdeacon.⁹⁰ The priest at Venestanville, already noted for an affair with another man's wife, also had a problem with gambling and drinking.⁹¹ Both William of Guilmerville and the priest at Realcamp frequented taverns, and reportedly took off their clothes there, which likely meant they gambled them away.⁹²

The behavior of these curates was not due to a lack of education, as has been previously argued; rather, their actions signified their participation in local, male culture.⁹³ The case of Adam, priest of Yvecrique, demonstrates that educational level was not always the problem for these ministers. In 1248, Adam was reputed to be frequently absent from his parish; the priest, according to the archbishop, had no excuses for frequenting taverns because he had wine in his own home. Here, the archbishop indicated his primary concern was Adam's visits to the tavern, not necessarily the consumption of alcohol. Adam was also in trouble with the archbishop for his rebellion against the dean and his affairs with two women, one married and the other the mother of his child.⁹⁴ Adam appeared again before the archbishop in 1251 to offer a bond of 40 *livres* as security if "he lives dishonorably" (*si inhoneste vivat*) in the parish or anywhere else; the archbishop granted permission to the cleric to attend the university for further training. Ten years later in 1258, Adam submitted a letter of defamation swearing that he would resign his church if found guilty of illicit sexual behavior or of frequenting taverns.⁹⁵

Adam's next mention in the visitation record is in 1260, and his new title, *magister*, indicates his success at the university; yet education was not the panacea for Adam's unruly behavior. Twelve years after his first offense was noted, Master Adam was still frequenting the taverns, eating and drinking with his friends, laymen Robert Gondree and John Huese. When summoned before the archbishop, he confessed under oath that he had been excommunicated three times and that he had not celebrated Mass except at Christmas. Yet Master

Adam had not neglected his pastoral responsibility entirely. He did show concern for the souls of some in society; he admitted he had administered the Eucharist to women giving birth and also heard their confessions, and that he had been baptizing children, both groups with high mortality rates.⁹⁶ Adam's errant ways continued, yet he refused to resign his church, as he had promised in his letter of defamation. The church at Yvecrique drew an annual income of 50 *livres*, a considerable sum for a Norman parish church. Odo eventually deprived Adam of his church in 1262, because he failed to appear before the archbishop for a hearing.⁹⁷

Clerics who frequented taverns could cast away their religious identities, if only for a brief time, and adapt a different masculine performance. When William of Guilmerville was first warned about his behavior in 1248, he was also threatened with serious punishment if he and the rest of the priests in his deanery did not wear clerical robes (*capas clausas*). Ten years later, the archbishop cited him for being frequently absent from his church and not wearing a priest's gown (because he left it in the tavern?). Additionally, Odo ordered his dean to make an inquiry into whether William was a drunkard, if he frequented taverns and engaged in "evil and dishonorable behavior" in the neighboring villages.⁹⁸ Six years later, William was disciplined for the same offenses. He submitted a letter of defamation, admitting that he habitually drank in the taverns, undressed in the taverns, gambled, and pawned the liturgical books of his church. He swore that if he was accused of these things again, and was unable to purge himself canonically, then he would resign. He presided over one of the poorest churches in the diocese; its annual income was only 12 *livres*.⁹⁹ William had transgressed the boundary between the lay and clerical spheres and had cast away the most basic symbol of his clerical status: his priest's robe.

While the tavern provided a temporary reprieve from the constraints of religious manliness, priestly participation in secular manliness sometimes spilled into the outside world, where clerics participated in violence and athletic contests. Manliness could be demonstrated by violence or simply the threat of violence. Brawling was a fight for reputation, a defense against a perceived insult; for a cleric, one could assume it was a defense of manliness.¹⁰⁰ Under what circumstances might a priest or cleric believe his honor to be impugned? What might incite him to violence inside a tavern or elsewhere? The most obvious inducements to fighting would be slurs against his manhood, an accusation of dishonorable conduct through cheating perhaps, but also a slur against his virility. It is difficult to imagine a medieval priest spurred to violence because

a tavern-goer questioned his chastity; more likely, clerics engaged in brawls to defend themselves against questions of their sexual prowess.

Ecclesiastical control of the priestly male body extended toward acts of physical aggression, participation in sports or violent activity. Odo's register notes that clerics participated in sports, along with brawls and fatal altercations.¹⁰¹ Violence in the Middle Ages could be a marker of manliness in that it proved fearlessness, physical strength, and dominance; at the same time, it demonstrated a lack of self-control. The Church had some ambivalence to the role of violence in the service of God. After all, violence was justifiable if it served to defend the Christian community (against heretics or infidels) because then it was part of an orderly system, which connected prowess to chivalry.¹⁰² The violence surrounding petty circumstances, like gambling disputes or drunkenness, was generally perceived by the Church as unjustifiable violence because it was created from passion, without legitimate purpose. Yet in certain medieval contexts, this sort of male violence was acceptable, especially when it occurred in situations surrounding alcohol and sexual rivalries.¹⁰³ While there was an aristocratic ethos that dictated the rules of violence for that social stratum, it bore little resemblance to the perception and practice of violence by those in the lower levels of society. By their participation in violent acts, parish priests engaged in a local, masculine culture, where a physical display of aggression signified manliness more so than the need for somatic control.

Often, the display of an intimidating presence offered the threat of violence in a controlled manner; it also allowed the priest to transgress the boundary into lay society and function as a participant. William, priest at Nesle-Normandeuse, along with being accused of sexual indiscretions and having a child, engaged in a duel with a knight, with the cheering support of his family and friends; his father was the patron of his church.¹⁰⁴ Matthew, priest at Vieux-Rouen, in addition to sleeping around with various women, did not dress as a priest and walked about with a sword.¹⁰⁵ The priest at Baudribosc also did not dress as a priest and behaved like a squire; he participated in tournaments and neglected his duties by his frequent absences.¹⁰⁶ These examples illustrate the ways clerics might maintain their connection to their lay origins and, one might expect, to those ideas of masculinity.

What might the athletic stylization of the body suggest about manliness to the Church and to lay society? The vigor of physical exercise equated vitality, and by extension, virility. Norman male culture also employed the use of athletic contests for bonding and for competition. The Church's opposition to

clerics' participation in athletic contests stemmed not only from the potential for injury and violence, but also from the blurring of lines between layman and cleric. *Soule*, a game similar to field hockey and football, in which two opposing teams battled for control of a leather-covered piece of wood, punching, kicking, and hitting it with sticks, was popular among young men between fifteen and twenty-four; players were frequently injured and sometimes killed.¹⁰⁷ There are at least two cases of priests playing *soule* in the register. The priest at Saint Vaast de Dieppedale confessed to injuring another player during a game of *soule*. In this case, the priest was convicted and promised to resign if found guilty again.¹⁰⁸ Another priest, from Royville, who had an affair with a stonecutter's wife, also rode about on horseback in a soldier's cape and played *soule*.¹⁰⁹

Quarreling and the use of scurrilous speech were antithetical to the integrity of the priestly body. Scurrilous speech displayed emotion and passion, not control and reason.¹¹⁰ Priests sometimes engaged in quarrels with their parishioners; these quarrels also show that sexual rivalries and acts of violence overlapped. In the deanery of Bacqueville, Odo reported that two priests were cited for their heated quarrels with their parishioners.¹¹¹ On some occasions, quarrels escalated into extreme physical violence. William, the priest at Mannevillette, already cited for pugnacious behavior, appeared before the archbishop in 1263 for brawling with and beating his parishioners.¹¹² William was cited again in 1265, this time for theft and frequent brawling, and was ordered to undergo canonical purgation.¹¹³ Such behavior intimidated parishioners, and on at least one occasion it made an entire town fearful of their curate. The village of Bray informed the archbishop as he passed through town that their priest (also rumored of sexual incontinence) was quarrelsome and even abusive to them and that he roamed the town at night armed with a weapon.¹¹⁴ Odo Rigaldus took the charges seriously and summoned the priest to Sasseuse, where he warned him to abstain from such behavior or face legal proceedings.¹¹⁵ Another priest at Vernonnet, suspected of an affair with an artisan's wife, quarreled with his parishioners and also assaulted the provost of his town.¹¹⁶

Whatever their motivations, one can construe the violent actions of these priests as simultaneously serving to underscore their manliness. Some priests who had appeared before Odo for sexual transgressions also appear later in his register for serious crimes of violence. For example, Girard had appeared before Odo Rigaldus earlier in 1257 and confessed to having sex with two women.¹¹⁷ He appeared before the archbishop again in December 1261 to answer charges of assault, for wounding a local lord's servant. He said that he stabbed Peter

Vivier with his sword, but only because the man threw himself on it.¹¹⁸ Girard does not explain, nor does Odo ask, exactly why he was carrying a sword, which was prohibited by canon law. In another case, Geoffrey, priest of Grigneuseville, rumored of sexual indiscretions, submitted a letter, in which he stated,

I, Geoffrey, presbyter of Grigneuseville, to all who view this letter, that when the venerable man, the archdeacon of Rouen, found me seriously ill-famed of incontinence, and warned and corrected me for it, and after warning and discipline for this I relapsed, I freely [and] willingly, promised the reverend father O.[do], by the grace of God the archbishop of Rouen, that if he finds me ill-famed of this again, if I am unable to purge myself, that I will pay him 30 *livres turonenses* as a penalty.¹¹⁹

Four years later, in August 1252, he was summoned to appear before the archbishop to answer charges of homicide. Geoffrey did not appear, but instead went on the lam and was subsequently excommunicated. Odo deprived the priest of his benefice four months later in January.¹²⁰

Violent priests were sometimes removed, and on other occasions given a second opportunity for reform. Odo found that Walter of Theuville had behaved so badly that he suspended him from his duties; Walter was found guilty of wounding Gerard of Theuville in August 1252.¹²¹ Richard, priest at Totes, was accused in 1251 of killing two merchants and also for harboring thieves.¹²² His day for canonical purgation was assigned and noted in Odo's register. The results of his investigation are not known, but it is likely he proved his innocence because twelve years later he appeared again before Odo to resign his church. He swore in the presence of his brother, the knight Nicholas of Bretteville, that he would not try to reclaim it in the future.¹²³ Other priests were not so fortunate. Ralph, rector at Senville, submitted a letter in which he admitted being accused of fornication, adultery, gambling, frequenting taverns, and seriously wounding the chaplain at Roncherolles in the head. Odo noted in the margins of his letter that the priest had been convicted and incarcerated.¹²⁴

The circumstances that led the archbishop to remove errant priests from office, while allowing some to continue, are not known, but there is the possibility that powerful lay patrons (or ecclesiastical ones), as well as powerful familial networks, might have exerted their influence to prevent their clerics from being removed from office. Many accused clerics used tactics to delay their

disciplinary action and often were successful in achieving delays of several years. John, the priest at Civières, was first brought before Odo Rigaldus in November 1261. Odo ordered him to undergo canonical purgation for sexual indiscretions, adultery, fighting, and frequenting taverns. The seriousness of the offenses was shown by the requirement that John appear with nine compurgators, all priests. John appeared a month later and was permitted yet another day for canonical purgation. Odo also reduced the number of compurgators to seven priests, an indication of leniency.¹²⁵ It is unclear whether John actually produced the necessary compurgators. However, he did submit a letter of defamation:

To all who view this [letter], John, rector of the church of Civières, greeting in the Lord. Be it known that when I was seriously defamed of incontinence with my parishioners and other women, frequenting taverns, and fighting . . . seeing that the same father [Odo Rigaldus] can proceed against me, if he wishes . . . on account of his mercy with me, I promise and swear, hand on my chest, touching the Holy Gospels, that I will resign my church without further cause at the will of the said father, simply and absolutely, and will not reclaim it, and I will have it for resignation, whenever the said father requests it.¹²⁶

John acknowledged the accusation of illicit sexual behavior, of frequenting taverns, and of fighting. He acknowledged the authority of Odo to remove him from office, and he promised to comply with Odo's order to resign. Clearly, the letter of defamation did not settle the matter. Four months later, in April 1261 John appeared again before Odo on the same charges. The archbishop ordered an investigation and found conclusive evidence. John requested a copy of the charges and the inquiry into his behavior, but Odo refused. Instead, he again ordered John to purge himself canonically with the seventh hand of priests.¹²⁷ It should be noted that Odo had the authority to remove him from office, without allowing him any opportunity to admit his guilt and promise to reform. But John of Civières chose not to make use of Odo's leniency in the matter; he failed to show up on the appointed day, thereby relinquishing his opportunity to defend himself and provide counterevidence of the charges. Even so, Odo scheduled a second purgation, but the priest still did not appear.

If John of Civières ever defended himself, it was not recorded in the register. Still, he continued to serve in his church, as before. Two years later, in Sep-

tember 1264, he faced disciplinary action again, as he was ordered to appear with seven compurgators for the crime of sexual incontinence.¹²⁸ This time, the archbishop was ready to remove this priest from office. When John appeared with his compurgators, the archbishop waived the purgation, believing that the compurgators would be rejected; John was given another day to fulfill the oath sworn in his letter, that of resignation.¹²⁹ However, John did not immediately resign and was given yet another chance to correct his behavior. In May 1265, he was still the priest at Civières. Once again, Odo attempted disciplinary action against the priest for his previous charges of fornication and fighting; once again, the priest admitted being defamed of these and other offenses.¹³⁰ He asked Odo for mercy and swore to resign his church. Finally, in August 1265, the priest voluntarily resigned.

The case of John of Civières demonstrates that reform was difficult and that Odo Rigaldus was willing to allow second, and sometimes third, chances. John of Civières promised reform of his ways, yet he did not deliver. At any time, Odo Rigaldus had the legal authority to remove John from office; he allowed him to remain, in spite of his continual errant behavior, for four years. Our knowledge of this case is limited to what was recorded in the register, but quite possibly other factors, such as a powerful lay patron, may have influenced the archbishop's decision to provide leniency. It also shows that rectors were reluctant to change their behavior, even at the risk of losing their benefices, and that they were unwilling to comply with orders that they resign their offices. A priest who resigned his office due to misbehavior was left without an income and a profession. John's annual parish income was 60 *livres*, one of the highest listed in the diocesan census. This alone could explain his motivation for delaying his hearing and for avoiding his promised resignation. As long as he served as priest, John could collect the parish income.

The behavior of these clerics is a strong indication that previous reform efforts were erratic and ineffective and that Odo Rigaldus was the first reforming archbishop seriously to enforce standards of clerical behavior. The intersection between drunkenness, violence, and sexual indiscretions reinforced the reformers' notions that all three created disorderly, scandalized bodies. In the eyes of reformers like Odo Rigaldus, manliness was expressed through bodily asceticism, through a rigorous control of the male body; the laxity of the body created a loss of manliness. His visitations to the Norman parishes from 1248 to 1269 paint a very different picture of the priesthood. Celibacy was not the only obstacle for the Norman parish clergy. These men found themselves theoretically cut

off from the cultural markers of manliness in their towns and villages. Priests' participation in such behavior allowed them entry into the local, masculine culture of their towns and villages. Their visits to local taverns allowed them to function as any other man in their community; inside tavern walls, these priests shared camaraderie with villagers, they competed with laymen, and they were able to display their bodies as lay ones, with all the meanings tied to such actions. Essentially, they exemplified a lay masculinity, refusing to adopt the manly priest model. For these clerics, the priesthood was an occupation, not a life-long vocation that required the embrace of ascetic values, an elevation above ordinary men and a sacrifice of the traditional household.

Conclusion



The Manly Priest

The court records of the officiality of Cerisy-la-Forêt (diocese of Bayeux) report the same stories told from previous centuries. In 1374, the priest Guillaume le Deen was brought before the court to address the *fama* that said he was sexually involved with his servant, Rogera. In another case, the vicar of Deux Jumeaux, Robert le Godet, was rumored of living with Flori as if married; he was also involved with Galienne, who conceived a child from him a year later.¹ Although clerical celibacy had been the rule for more than two hundred years, some priests continued to form quasi-marital unions with women well into the later Middle Ages. What seems to have changed by the fourteenth century is the number of priests who appear before the court for these crimes. Unlike Odo Rigaldus's lengthy lists of ill-famed clerics, the court of Cerisy routinely heard only one to two cases per year regarding the sexual behavior of priests, and some of those were of repeat offenders.²

By the fifteenth century, the manly priest model clearly delineated priest from laymen; the reforms efforts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had succeeded in elevating the priesthood and marking off this higher spiritual status, at least theoretically, with chaste celibacy.³ Clerical celibacy had become a normative value of priestly masculinity. Throughout the era of reform in England and Normandy, the language of manliness was used to enforce an ascetic standard of the male body as the emblem of clerical life. The elevation of the priest and his separation from the laity required his adoption of a radically different standard of manliness than that espoused by the laymen of his community. This ascetic standard of sexualized chastity and bodily integrity changed the priestly body by moving the practice of manliness away from sexual conquest to the

personal struggle for sexual abstinence. This focus had serious consequences for the secular clergy who had traditionally married and who, after the Conquest, were placed in high ecclesiastical positions in England. It also had implications for the pattern of kinship that was central to Anglo-Norman power networks.

This ideology of the manly celibate took root at the same time as the campaign against clerical marriage. Anglo-Norman clerics defended their ability to marry, emphasizing the normative role of marital sexuality. They also highlighted the fornication that would occur if clerics were denied marriage. The same writers who defended marriage also promoted the ability of a priest's son to enter Holy Orders and obtain a benefice. Despite the widespread and literate resistance to mandated celibacy from the secular clergy, the manly celibate ideal did succeed in reforming the elite clergy. Bishops, canons, and archdeacons were the first to conform to this standard. By the thirteenth century, however, a sizeable contingent of the lower clergy was still unreformed. It appears that local norms of gender performance were more powerful in determining a curate's behavior than the restrictive laws governing the disorderly priestly body. The pastoral revolution of the thirteenth century further narrowed the standards of manliness for the priesthood. Rather than strictly focusing on breaches of chastity, thirteenth-century reformers disciplined the priestly body in its entirety: speech, drunkenness, violence, and appearance all became regulated as part of a rigid definition of manliness.

The resistance of the parish clergy to this new model was common across medieval Europe. Most studies on this subject from outside Normandy focus on clerical concubinage and fornication, rather than on the changes brought to gender identity and the reconceptualization of the entire priestly body. Research from the later Middle Ages shows that the ecclesiastical ideal of celibate manliness did not easily succeed the sexualized priestly body. The cases mentioned above from the ecclesiastical court at Cerisy are not unique; scholarly analyses of clerical concubinage from late medieval England, Spain, Italy, and Germany show that parish priests did continue living with women in quasi-marital relationships hundreds of years after clerical celibacy was the enforced rule of law.⁴ Thus, while the vocal advocacy of clerical marriage died out in the early twelfth century, clerical unions did not. While the exact numbers of clerical unions are unknown, it is certain that Catholic priests knew by the late Middle Ages what kinds of behavior and bodily comportment were appropriate and expected for a Church-defined clerical manliness.

If clerical marriage in Normandy was so culturally entrenched and widely

supported, how did reformers successfully enforce celibacy? Or did they? Around the turn of the twelfth century, vocal advocates like the Norman Anonymous lobbied for the right of priests to marry, but by the 1130s these voices had disappeared, and no one, cleric or other, spoke out in the defense of this custom.⁵ C. N. L. Brooke has offered an explanation for why clerical marriage died out among the upper clergy by the 1150s: clerical sons and clerical wives needed to face “illegitimacy” for a couple of generations before the reformers’ efforts became effective.⁶ To be sure, Lateran I’s invalidation of marriage for those in major orders must have been a primary factor in silencing clerical marriage proponents. Once an ecumenical council declared that marriage was an impediment to Holy Orders, any dissent could be seen as heretical and, for that matter, futile in a rapidly changing religious environment given over to ascetic ideology. The development of canon law and the ecclesiastical legal system also made it possible for such decrees to be credited to a universal Church, not just regional ideologues. Brooke offers some important answers to this question, but a few caveats need to be made in light of recent research. Clerical unions among the upper clergy, whom Brooke defined as bishops, archdeacons, canons, and regulars, did become increasingly rare after the mid-twelfth century; yet clerical unions among the parish clergy still continued notably over the next three centuries. While the ecclesiastical legal system continued to develop, it could not eliminate all cases of clerical concubinage. Parish clergy were under less scrutiny than their elite colleagues, who had virtually no means to police and separate parish priests from their partners, at least until the process of episcopal visitation became a mandate in the thirteenth century.⁷ Thus, while there was no vocal advocacy of clerical unions, the practice still continued. This factor alone would negate Brooke’s idea that clerical women contributed to the decline in clerical marriage by refusing to engage in unions that would offer them no legitimacy, and therefore no status. At the same time, the concept of a marriage-like union may have been very fluid, even in an era when the Church increasingly tried to define and control it.⁸

The literate clerical voices defending marriage were silenced, and clerical marriage died out among the elite clergy probably by the mid-twelfth century, but certainly by the beginning of the thirteenth. Bishops and archdeacons were under greater scrutiny, and, with the force of canon law, a long-term sexual union could spell the end of an ecclesiastical career. All these explanations do not clarify why the ideal of the manly celibate became the normative paradigm for the priesthood. Why was there not a two-tier system of religious manli-

ness? One monastic and one priestly? One chaste and one married? Quite likely, this ideology became successful through the growth and diversity of monasticism in Normandy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. While there may have been differences in the religious experiences of the Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinians, and Premonstratensians, they all emphasized chaste celibacy as a prerequisite for religious life. The continuous appearance of sexualized chastity and the praise of celibacy in Anglo-Norman religious writings from this period reinforced these elements as the standard. Gradually, over the course of the next two centuries, monastics took positions as bishops, and cathedral chapters converted from secular to monastic. The entry of monastics into elite positions provided the appearance that this form of masculinity was normative for clerical life. Ecclesiastical elites set the standard; with canonical legislation against clerical marriage in place, this ideology had the force of law.

To be sure, just as the eradication of clerical marriage created problems of gender identity for priests transitioning from legitimate marriages to illicit unions, it also posed a conflict of masculinity for clerics in minor orders who hoped to one day acquire a benefice; this is a subject lacking in historical research. While cases of concubinous priests appear less in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Cerisy court record, clerics of indeterminate rank do appear frequently, brought before the official for cases of fornication, concubinage, and violence. The Benedictine abbey of St-Vigor was located at Cerisy, in the diocese of Bayeux; it had an ecclesiastical court, with jurisdiction over four parishes, Cerisy itself, Littry, Deux-Jumeaux, and St-Laurent-sur-Mer. Within its jurisdiction lay some twenty-five villages. The exact number of clergy who served this area is unknown. From 1390 to 1392, over 1,500 men were tonsured by the archbishop of Rouen, with over 14,000 tonsured in all Normandy during the second decade of the fifteenth century.⁹ Clerics in minor orders were not obliged to the vow of celibacy, but proceeding through all minor orders was a prerequisite to ascending the major orders of subdeacon, deacon, and priest. Thus, if a cleric in a minor order wished to one day acquire a church benefice, he would eventually have to proceed to Holy Orders, ranks that required celibacy. There is some scholarly dispute over how to perceive these mass tonsurings and the entry of hundreds, if not thousands, into the minor orders. Andrew Finch has treated this subject by assuming that men who entered minor orders were seeking nothing more than exemption from taxation and criminal prosecution in secular courts; in support of this theory, he offers that many such clerics also had other occupations. Pursuant to this line of inquiry, Finch treats the sexual,

quasi-marital unions of minor clerics as nothing more than lay unions, without attention to the issue of gender and religious identity. The illicit, concubinous relationships of priests are similarly acknowledged, and even downplayed, without further attention to the problematic nature of these unions, particularly for the later Middle Ages.¹⁰ Other historians also see clerical identity becoming less distinctive in the late Middle Ages. Patricia Cullum has examined the late medieval clergy in a different manner. Following the lead of R. N. Swanson, she has argued that men in late medieval England delayed ordination to the priesthood until they had secured a benefice because they were unwilling to commit to lifelong celibacy without the possibility of secured lifelong employment.¹¹ Unbeneficed clergy, especially those in minor orders, often lived in poverty; they received little compensation, insufficient to keep a household. According to the Cerisy court record, many clerics also had other occupations, as artisans or servants; this is an indication of the lack of financial stability and occupational future for those in lower orders.¹² These clerics, then, deserve different consideration, in light of their unusual social and economic place in the church hierarchy and local communities.

The Cerisy court furnishes evidence that minor clerics were affected by the differing sexual standards imposed on the priesthood and laity. While these men had clerical status, they were technically allowed to marry. Additionally, the vast number of men entering clerical orders meant increased competition for church benefices. A cleric in minor orders could no longer see his vocation as a steppingstone to the priesthood. He could marry, but he could not provide the economic stability necessary to sustain a household, something that men in other occupations could. More often than not, a minor cleric was a low-wage employee, with uncertain job prospects. If he married, he eliminated his opportunity for a higher clerical career. Clerics in minor orders were caught in a sort of gender liminality, unable to identify fully as laymen and unable (or unwilling) to embrace clerical manliness.

At Cerisy, ecclesiastical officials took the lead in defining the marital status of clerics in minor orders. Minor clerics faced very different penalties for concubinage and clandestine marriage from ordained priests or those in major orders generally. In the late twelfth century, canon lawyers like Stephen of Tournai had argued that clerics in minor orders could keep their concubines but could not ascend to Holy Orders; effectively, sexual unions of minor clerics ended their career mobility, barring them from ordination to the major orders and preventing them from acquiring a benefice. The canonist Rolandus differed on

this point, arguing that it was the particular kind of relationship that impeded one's ascension to Holy Orders; cohabitation with marital affection barred one from becoming a priest, while concubinage without marital affection offered no barriers to career mobility.¹³ Lateran IV (1215) was sufficiently general on this matter as to suggest that all clerics, even those in minor orders, should live "chastely and virtuously."¹⁴ The court at Cerisy performed two typical actions to remedy clerical fornication and concubinage for those in minor orders. One was to threaten to recognize a marriage if the couple involved did not cease their sexual relationship and/or cohabitation. The courts had difficulty enforcing abjurations *sub pena nubendi*; there was little ability to force a couple to legitimize their marriage, and the threat that continued association with each other would render them husband and wife did little to prevent couples from continuing their sexual relationships. The court at Cerisy shifted from demanding *sub pena nubendi* to levying fines, sometimes very heavy monetary penalties, to enforce a code of sexual behavior among the clerics who appeared in court. The average wages for this time period ranged from 10 to 25 *sous* per month, and with 20 *sous* the equivalent of 1 *livre*, it becomes apparent that fines of 50 *livres* or more cost the offender more than two years' wages.¹⁵ Incidentally, this was exactly the kind of punitive action used by the archbishop Odo Rigaldus to discipline his clergy, fifty years earlier.

A number of minor clerics were brought before the court at Cerisy and forced to legitimize their marriages or face a fine (or both). In 1314, the cleric Johannes de Mara appeared before the court and confessed to sexual incontinence and cohabitation for more than eight years with Nicola, the widow of Herbert Jupin. The cleric also had six children with Nicola. The court forbade Johannes to cohabit with Nicola and to have sexual relations with her, unless it was under the law of matrimony (*nisi hoc fuerit lege matrimonii*). It seems that matrimony was acceptable to Nicola, but not to Johannes. For some unknown reasons, he refused to marry his long-time partner and mother of his children. But the story was much more complex than that. It seems that Nicola claimed that Johannes *had* already married her, and Johannes so resisted this claim that Nicola feared violent reprisals from the cleric. He was ordered to give pledges of peace to her. Weeks later, Johannes admitted to contracting a marriage with Nicola and to consummating the union. He was ordered to solemnize the marriage or pay a fine of 50 *livres*. Yet by the following year (1314) Johannes had not made the union official, and was excommunicated.¹⁶ Was Johannes avoiding the public recognition of his marriage because he still hoped he might obtain a

benefice and ordination to the priesthood? Johannes' motive to avoid marriage is unknown. What is clear is that the court levied a severe penalty on this cleric. In a different case, German le Forestier was ordered to stay away from a widow, or face a fine of 10 *livres* and the penalty of marriage. The difference? German le Forestier was not a cleric. It seemed more important to the court that a cleric legitimize his marriage, thereby committing himself to the lay world, than to continue with a foot in each sphere.

So why did clerics in minor orders, like those already mentioned, choose to live unmarried with women, particularly those with whom they had children, when not only was marriage an available option, but it was, in some cases, mandated by the court as a remedy to concubinage? These cases confirm a fluidity to sexual relationships at the village level Ruth Karras has most recently addressed in her book on marital unions. Yet, we have to wonder how often clerics in minor orders put off solemnizing their clandestine unions because they recognized that it would effectively end their church careers, prohibiting them from ever acquiring a church benefice and ascending to Holy Orders. Clerical careers at the lower levels were not lucrative, particularly for rural areas. Some clerics took more than one occupation, like many noted in the Cerisy record. There may have been other reasons that a cleric was unwilling to solemnize a marriage, but we should not treat these kinds of clerical unions as equivalent to lay unions. Clearly, the courts saw illegitimate clerical unions as more problematic than those of the laity. But there are other concerns to be addressed. Ordination to the priesthood and acquisition of a benefice called not only for a life of chaste celibacy but also for a whole code of conduct that was isolating from a community of peers. Who might embrace such a model of masculinity without concrete assurances of a church benefice? Who would commit to a standard of rigorous bodily comportment on the slim chance he might one day assume control of a church?

The manly priest model of masculinity had far-reaching consequences. It not only affected ordained priests and others in major orders who had to conform to a new ideal of clerical conduct but it also placed minor clerics into a sort of gender liminality. To wed a woman ended one's chances for a church benefice and advancement into a successful career; it grounded a man in the masculine culture of his community. To live apart from a woman in chaste celibacy isolated him from the married (and/or sexually active) male community, as he hoped to acquire a benefice one day. Further research in this area is necessary to determine to what extent minor clerics were affected by the manly priest ideology.

Voices in favor of priestly marriage may have died out after the mid-twelfth century, but these same ideas were revived in the sixteenth century with the reformed movements that circulated throughout Europe. As Helen Parish writes, "Reformation was restoration rather than innovation" in the cause for clerical marriage.¹⁷ In fact, evangelical writers of the English Reformation made the very same case for the validity of clerical unions that their eleventh- and twelfth-century counterparts did, even citing those same sources. Ulric's *Rescripta* appeared in various forms in the works of English (and German) polemicists as they justified the sanctity of clerical marriage. The story of papal legate John of Crema and his fornication with a prostitute reappeared in the texts of major advocates for clerical marriage.¹⁸ By focusing on the rampant fornication among priests and by questioning the sacramental foundations of clerical celibacy, English reformers defended clerical marriage.¹⁹ In a similar manner, but perhaps more explicitly, Martin Luther and his reformed German contemporaries offered an extensive theological justification for marital sex. Luther's Catholic opponents used his marriage to Katharina von Bora as evidence that the German reformer sought nothing more than to satisfy his lust by bedding a former nun. Luther would not have disagreed completely. In his expositions on Genesis, he argued that the male libido was uncontrollable; if the male sex drive was forced into a chaste state, it would cause disorderliness in the form of fornication. Only those exceptional men who receive the "divine gift of abstinence" would be able to exist in a chaste body.²⁰ These sentiments were echoed by his contemporaries, Andreas Karlstadt and Philip Melancthon, who both confirmed that chastity was a gift from God and those who do not receive it seek remedy in the form of marital sex.²¹

The Reformation also resurrected sodomy as an accusation for those who embraced clerical celibacy; whereas, in the medieval reform period, monastic reformers were the targets of sodomy accusations, Reformation rhetoric instead cast sexual suspicion on the celibate priesthood. Celibate priests became the sodomites, their salvation lying in Christian marriage. This evolved into a specific discourse Helmut Puff has termed "the close encounter of matrimony and sodomy."²² With these very ideas, Reformation thinkers loosened the model of the manly priest, by allowing sex within marriage, sometimes even mandating it; furthermore, the legitimacy of clerical marriage also lent itself implicitly to the legitimacy of clerical offspring. In the German states, many priests and their women were able to reclaim, at least in theory if not practice, honorable status by converting to Protestantism, becoming legitimate husbands and wives.²³ In

England the situation was much more complex, as monarchical policy shifted back and forth during the era of the Tudors, to the extent that clerical marriages were legitimized and delegitimized with regularity, leading to great uncertainty regarding the priest's masculine status and the honorable status of his wife.²⁴

Yet, just as evangelical reformers relaxed restrictions on the priestly body by allowing clerical marriage, they also restricted priestly behavior by elevating it to a different standard of comportment. As the sexual body was reclaimed for Christian marriage, the male body was subjected to tighter regulation. There has been no monograph-length study to date of how Catholic priests who converted to evangelical Protestantism actually adjusted to this new standard of masculine identity; this leaves much room to be explored. However, recent studies on masculinity and the Reformation gesture toward some preliminary, albeit general conclusions. Protestants believed in the patriarchal household, which not only permitted a father (and a minister) to have legitimate sexual relations with his wife but also required him to discipline and control his wife and children as a manifestation of his manliness.²⁵ Those who served their churches through ministry came under this model of masculinity that once was applied only to laymen. With great rewards came great responsibilities. For the Calvinists of France, for example, instructing their children in correct doctrine, ensuring their marriages to righteous people, and supervising their prayers were all crucial functions of a father.

Reformed men incurred greater responsibility as elders who policed their communities.²⁶ In Reformation Geneva, men who fathered sons out of wedlock and who then abandoned them making no provisions for their maintenance, failed to embody the manliness required of a Calvinist father.²⁷ There is even more room to pursue how the major thinkers of the Reformation further defined the male body beyond sexuality. For example, Zwingli and Calvin saw bodily and social discipline as a solution for the disorder of the world. While both were proponents of clerical marriage, they differed from Luther in their view of alcohol consumption and drunkenness. Luther not only supported marital sex, but he also believed intoxication was an "occasional antidote" that relieved a host of maladies.²⁸ To be sure, Luther did consider intoxication a sin, but he also could excuse it on occasion, so long as it was not habitual. The priestly male body was once again reconfigured in the Reformation era. It is worth pursuing how much of this transformation went beyond sexuality to other forms of manly behavior and bodily comportment.

Any long-range examination must eventually end, yet more questions

remain about the long-term effects of the manly priest ideology during and after the Reformation era. The effects of the Council of Trent and Tridentine manhood on the Catholic clergy are especially worthy of a fuller examination. During the Reformation, Catholic counter-reformers did not rigidly stand by and rely on an older, seemingly static version of the manly priest model. Instead, the Catholic Church offered some modifications to the model of manliness, changes voiced by Catholic writers eager to demonstrate the vitality of a Catholic priestly masculinity in an age of challenge to the old order. For instance, Ignatius of Loyola was an example of this "reimagined clerical masculinity," one that could incorporate the older challenges of sexual self-control alongside an emotional piety, all the while emphasizing a bodily comportment of manly vigor. According to Ulrike Strasser, "this made Ignatian masculinity a more secure and hence more inviting variant of Tridentine manhood."²⁹

The priest-turned-pastor of the Reformation era, like his medieval brethren, might have lost something in the transitioning standards applied to the priestly male body. Legitimate marriage allowed sex, and only within marriage was sex allowed. For those clerics who demonstrated their virility, hence their manliness, by sexual conquest, the legal recognition of clerical marriage brought heavy responsibility to those who might have eschewed it. Legitimate marriage required monogamy and long-term commitment, traits undesirable for clerics who preferred fluid and changeable sexual unions. Clerical marriage brought with it a new pastoral/ministerial masculinity, where a believer took charge of his household, controlled his wife, and reared his children in the new faith; the priest-turn-husband was now a provider to a family, and that family's well-being depended exclusively on him. Personal salvation was an individual responsibility, and tavern frequenting, fornication, brawling, and drunkenness seriously jeopardized the soul, a peril that could not be expiated through the confessional. The same concerns about the impenetrable male body resurfaced, only with a far superior apparatus to discipline the body.³⁰ The Reformation offered the containment of sexual desire through marriage and the legitimacy of offspring to the clergy, but it also brought a different set of restrictions to the priestly body.

Notes



Introduction. Gendered Bodies and Gendered Identities

1. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, trans. John J. Hagen (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 137–38, 144.
2. Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), xlv–xlv.
3. For the debate over the apostolic origins of a celibate clergy, see Christian Cochini, *The Apostolic Origins of Priestly Celibacy* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990); and Helen L. Parish, *Clerical Celibacy in the West, c.1100–1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), chap. 1, for an overview of this scholarly debate.
4. 1 Cor. 7:2, 7:8.
5. Paul Beaudette, “In the World but not of it’: Clerical Celibacy as a Symbol of the Medieval Church,” in *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Garland, 1998), 25–27; see also Parish, chap. 2.
6. See Brown, *The Body and Society*; also Aline Rousselle, *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity* (New York: Blackwell, 1988).
7. For a complete overview of the history of sacerdotal celibacy, see Parish.
8. This was not the case for the Eastern Orthodox Church, which permitted clerical marriage. For more on this difference, see Eve Levin, *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs, 900–1700* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989), 248–54.
9. Beaudette, 27.
10. Ibid., 24.
11. Samuel Laeuchli, *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972); and F. X. Funk, “Colibart und Priesterehe im Christlichen Altertum,” *Kirchen Geschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen* 1 (1897): 121–55, both argue for more influence on the part of Elvira; see also Parish, 42–44, for a discussion of the various attitudes of this council in the history of clerical celibacy.
12. Charles A. Frazee, “The Origins of Clerical Celibacy in the Western Church,” *Church History* 57 (1988): 114–15.
13. Council of Carthage (390) and (401), in *Sacrorum Conciliorum*, ed. Mansi, 3: 692–93, 969. For discussion over the primacy of this council, see Parish, 42–45.
14. For the Carolingian era, see Lynda Coon, *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic*

Practice in the Early Medieval West (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); and Rachel Stone, "Gender and Hierarchy: Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims (845–882) as a Religious Man," in *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. P. H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), 28–45.

15. Frank Barlow, *The English Church, 1066–1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church* (Longman, 1979), 58.

16. Ibid., 73–84. See Jorg Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c.1140–c.1230* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), appendix 1, 260–62, for a list of all men appointed to Norman dioceses during this period. With the exception of Sées, there were only two monastics appointed to bishoprics. The Sées chapter had converted from secular to regular in the mid-twelfth century, and the majority of its bishops were monastic.

17. E. U. Crosby, *The King's Bishops: The Politics of Patronage in England and Normandy, 1066–1216* (New York: Palgrave, 2013), 191.

18. See Raymond Foreville, "The Synod of the Province of Rouen in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," in *Church and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke et al., trans. Geoffrey Martin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 37.

19. For more on Normandy's high percentage of lay patronage, see Marcel Baudot, "Observatoire sur le patronage des églises en Normandie," in *Recueil d'études Normandes en hommage au docteur Jean Fournée: Cahiers Léopold Delisle, no. exceptionnel 1978* (Nogent-sur-Marne: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Normandes, 1979), 43–44; Guy Devaillay, "Les patronats d'église en Normandie aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles," in *Recueil d'études en hommage à Lucien Musset, Cahier des Annales de Normandie* 23 (1990): 351–59.

20. Achille Luchaire, *Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus*, trans. Edward B. Krehbiel (New York: Ungar, 1957), 41, says that ecclesiastical patronage resulted in a "better selection of the parochial clergy," while lay patronage created "a grievous situation for the dignity and even the morality of the incumbent priests." Adam J. Davis, *The Holy Bureaucrat: Eudes Rigaud and Religious Reform in Thirteenth-Century Normandy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006), 107, dismisses this idea and presents a small, refuting analysis based on the *diffamationes* in Odo's register. I presented more extensive research confirming Davis's conclusion in "Family Networks and Ecclesiastical Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Normandy: A Reassessment," at the Texas Medieval Association Conference (October 2006). I conclude that there is no significant correlation between patron and quality of the clergy; religious patrons were as likely as lay patrons to present morally unsuitable priests to parish churches.

21. C. N. L. Brooke, "Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050–1200," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 12, 1 (1956): 7. Here Brooke is referring to the "exceptional problem" of clerical concubinage from 1250 on, particularly among parish clergy. But the evidence presented in Chapter 5, along with my discussion of the polemical treatises by pro-marriage clerics in Chapter 3, will show otherwise.

22. Toward this goal, I have made particular use of the prosopographies completed by Diana Greenway, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1066–1300*, 10 vols., 9 available at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/catalogue.aspx?gid=39>; along with David Spear, *The Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals During the Ducal Period, 911–1204* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2006); and Vincent Tabbagh, *Diocèse de Rouen, Fasti Ecclesiae Gallicanae* 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), on late medieval Rouen.

23. Judith Bennett, "Feminism and History," *Gender and History* 1 (1989): 251–72.

24. See Parish, 88–89, for a summary of these views. Gerd Tellenbach in particular objects to the idea that clerical celibacy was the center of the papal reform movement. See Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 161–67.

25. For the Carolingian era, see Mayke de Jong, “Imitatio Morum: The Cloister and Clerical Purity in the Carolingian World,” in Frassetto, 49–80; for the Council of Pavia and the role of cultic purity in the legislation of Gregory VII, see Uta-Renate Blumenthal, “Pope Gregory VII and the Prohibition of Nicolaitism,” in Frassetto, 239–67; for a contrary assessment that places moral suitability as the motive behind clerical celibacy, see H. E. J. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Chastity of the Clergy,” in the same volume, 269–302.

26. Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (London: Routledge, 1970), 79–80.

27. Dyan Elliott, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), chap. 1; Jacqueline Murray, “The law of sin that is in my members: The Problem of Male Embodiment,” in *Gender and Holiness: Men, Women, and Saints in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Sam Riches and Sarah Salih (London: Routledge, 2002), 9–22; and Conrad Leyser, “Masculinity in Flux: Nocturnal Emission and the Limits of Celibacy in the Early Middle Ages,” in Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 103–20.

28. Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, 11–12.

29. Most recently, see the collection of essays on the subject and the Introduction, in Cullum and Lewis, eds., *Religious Men and Masculine Identity*, 6.

30. Vern Bullough, “On Being a Male in the Middle Ages,” in *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 34. Derek Neal, *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008),

31. R. N. Swanson, “Angels Incarnate: Clergy and Masculinity from Gregorian Reform to the Reformation,” in Hadley, ed., 160–77; in this well-cited article, Swanson has argued that the medieval clergy consisted of a third gender. David D’Avray has followed suit in his *Medieval Marriage: Symbolism and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 89. Jacqueline Murray further pursued this question in her essay “One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?” in *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Felice Lifshitz and Lisa Bitel (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 48–49, where she allows the possibility of chastity (but not necessarily clerical celibacy) as a third gender.

32. Ruth Mazo Karras, “Thomas Aquinas’s Chastity Belt: Clerical Masculinity in Medieval Europe,” in Lifshitz and Bitel, eds., *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*, 63–64.

33. P. H. Cullum, “Clergy, Masculinity and Transgression in Late Medieval England,” in Hadley, ed., 178–96; also “Life-Cycle and Life-Course in a Clerical and Celibate Milieu: Northern England in the Later Middle Ages,” in *Time and Eternity: The Medieval Discourse*, ed. Gerhard Jaritz and Gerson Moreno-Riano (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 271–81.

34. Derek Neal, *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 89–122.

35. Janelle Werner, “Promiscuous Priests and Vicarage Children: Clerical Sexuality and Masculinity in Late Medieval England,” in *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks, and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jennifer D. Thibodeaux (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010), 159–81, 174.

36. Ruth M. Karras, *Unmarriages: Women, Men and Sexual Unions in the Middle Ages*

(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), chap. 3; Roisin Cossar, "Clerical 'Concubines' in Northern Italy in the Fourteenth Century," *Journal of Women's History* 23 (2011): 110–31; Daniel Bornstein, "Priests and Villagers in the Diocese of Cortona," *Ricerche Storiche* 27 (1997): 93–106; Marie Kelleher, "'Like Man and Wife': Clerics' Concubines in the Diocese of Barcelona," *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 349–60.

37. John of Forde, *The Life of Wulfic of Haselbury, Anchorite*, trans. Pauline Matarasso (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2011), 22–23.

38. Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, chap. 4, on priests' wives.

39. Anne L. Barstow, *Married Priests and Reforming Papacy* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1982). See also the essays in Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety*.

Chapter 1. The Manly Celibate

1. *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 3: 145–47; hereafter noted as OV, and passages marked by volume and page number. I have substituted the word "manfully" for Chibnall's term "boldly." I explain below the reasoning behind such interpretation.

2. See Jacqueline Murray, "Masculinizing Religious Life: Sexual Prowess, the Battle for Chastity and Monastic Identity," in Lewis and Cullum, eds., *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, 24–42, for this trend among reformers.

3. Because the texts surveyed here reached mixed audiences, I must offer an alternative to Ruth Karras's suggestion that scholars use caution in seeing texts like *vitae* as examples of intent to make celibate clerics be seen as masculine. When the texts are examined collectively, one can see the same image of celibate clerics presented in all of them, which would suggest an effort to create an alternative model of manliness. These ideas may have been products of monastic institutions, but they were part of a larger discourse that reached outside the monastery. See Ruth Karras, "Thomas Aquinas's Chastity Belt," 60. For the audiences of these texts, see Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c.550 to c.1307* (London: Routledge, 1974), *passim*.

4. Maureen Miller, although acknowledging the existence of such language in the early Middle Ages, still sees a substantial increase in its use during the reform era and in "increasingly assertive terms." See Maureen C. Miller, "Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era," *Church History* 72, 1 (March 2003): 28, 28n8.

5. See Mathew Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 21, 24–25, for how the late Romans also characterized men in this manner.

6. For the history behind such masculine language, see *ibid.*, 20–21.

7. Kirsten A. Fenton, *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 43–46, 49; see also Miller, "Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture."

8. Megan McLaughlin, "The Bishop in the Bedroom: Witnessing Episcopal Sexuality in the Age of Reform," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19, 1 (January 2010): 22. Also, see Miller, "Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture," 27–28.

9. Orderic Vitalis employs 100 uses of the terms *viriliter* (manfully) and *virilis* (manly) in his *Ecclesiastical History*, but in many cases these terms describe laymen, not clerics.

10. For the details of this argument, see Miller, "Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture," 25–53.

11. Caroline Walker Bynum's monumental and influential essay, "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing" in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), first pointed to the gendered language used by monastic writers, particularly the Cistercians.

12. See for instance JoAnn McNamara, "The Herrenfrage: The Restructuring of the Gender System, 1050–1150," in *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), which conflates the maternal imagery presented by Bynum with an actual self-identification by monastic writers. McNamara concludes that for monks "the safest way to restore the gender system was to play both roles and, by implication, deny the need for women in any capacity" (20).

13. Bynum, "Jesus as Mother," 154–56.

14. Ibid., 144; for the particular writing of Bernard of Clairvaux on this subject, see *Sancti Bernardi opera*, ed. Jean Leclercq et al. (Rome 1957–), 1: 65–66.

15. Bynum, "Jesus as Mother," 161.

16. Ibid., 113–15, for her presentation of this text.

17. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. and annotated Walter Frolich (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1993), 2: 112; hereafter referred to by volume and page number. Frolich here uses "valiantly" for the adverb *viriliter*, which I have translated "manfully."

18. Ibid., 2: 132.

19. Ibid., 2: 196.

20. OV 3: 169.

21. OV 3: 151. Chibnall's translation used the term "strenuously" for *viriliter*.

22. *Epistolae Herberti de Losinga, Osberti de Clara et Elmeri Prioris Cantuariensis*, trans. Robert Anstruther (Charleston, S.C.: Nabu Press, 2012), 30; *The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga*, ed. Edward Meyrick Goulburn and Henry Symonds (Oxford: James Parker, 1878), 1: 134.

23. Geoffrey Grossus, *The Life of Blessed Bernard of Tiron*, trans. Ruth Harwood Cline (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 21–22.

24. Ibid., 76.

25. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 192.

26. Hugh the Chanter, *The History of the Church of York, 1066–1127*, ed. and trans. Charles Johnson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 75–77.

27. *The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales*, trans. H. E. Butler (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), 57. The nobility was "loud in praise of the courage and manhood shown by the Arch-deacon" (55–56).

28. Ibid., 93.

29. *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia: et opuscula duo de vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam miraculis ejus Historia Novorum* (hereafter noted as *Historia Novorum*), ed. Martin Rule, Rolls Series 81 (London: Longman, 1884). He only uses the adverb *viriliter* three times in the entire *Historia Novorum*.

30. Ibid., 18–19; Eadmer, *History of Recent Events in England*, trans. Geoffrey Bosanquet (London: Cresset, 1964), 19–20.

31. Grossus, 58. I agree with Cline's translation with the exception of the term *viriliter*, which she translates as "firmly."

32. Hugh the Chanter, 27.

33. Ibid., 26–27. Also could be translated as "let him labor manfully," closer to the Latin used.

34. Ibid., 28–31.
35. Ephesians 2:15; see also Ephesians 4:24.
36. Katherine Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), 52–63.
37. *Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 1: 280.
38. OV 3: 229.
39. OV 3: 325–27.
40. OV 3: 133.
41. For Herluin's *vita* by Gilbert Crispin, see Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Latina* (PL) 150: 697–712. See also Sally Vaughn's translation of the document in *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State, 1034–1136* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981), 68–86.
42. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, 68.
43. Ibid., 71.
44. Ibid., 72–73.
45. Raymonde Foreville and Jean Leclercq, “Un débat sur le sacerdoce des moines au XIIe siècle,” in *Analecta Monastica* 4th ser. (Rome: Vaticana, 1957), 85.
46. OV 3: 120–21
47. OV 3: 121–23
48. OV 3: 253.
49. OV 3: 107.
50. OV 3: 20–23.
51. OV 3: 51.
52. *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. Giles Constable, trans. Bernard S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 53.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid., 55.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., 49.
57. Ibid., 55.
58. OV 3: 45–47. The other priest, Adelard, upon leaving the monastery, is unable to return to his church and experiences continual illness until he eventually dies.
59. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* (*The History of the English Bishops*), ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon, 2007), 1: 261; hereafter referred to as GPA by volume and page number.
60. OV 3: 26–29.
61. OV 3: 85–87.
62. Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, 49. I have changed the wording from “as becomes a man” to “manly.”
63. Council of Westminster, 676, in *Councils and Synods*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock. Canon 10, “Ut presbyteri non eant ad potationes, nec ad pinnas bibant”; canon 11, “ut vestes clericorum sint unius coloris, et calcimenta ordinata.” The Council of Melfi (1089) also decreed a similar canon on clerical clothing, canon 13.
64. Fenton, *Gender, Nation and Conquest*, 66–67.
65. OV 6: 64–67. See Pauline Stafford, “The Meanings of Hair in the Anglo-Norman World: Masculinity, Reform and National Identity,” in *Saints, Scholars and Politicians: Gender as a Tool in Medieval Studies*, ed. M. van Dijk and Renee Nip (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005),

153–71. In her analysis of hair customs, Stafford points out that “The language of reform was already a gendered language at the end of the eleventh century” (163).

66. OV 6: 66–67.

67. OV 6: 69.

68. William of Malmesbury, *Saints' Lives: Lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 59.

69. See Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 201–9.

70. OV 4: 188–89.

71. OV 3: 106–7.

72. Henry of Huntingdon, *History of the English People, 1000–1154*, trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 2009), 56.

73. William of Malmesbury's *Chronicle of the Kings of England*, trans. J. A. Giles (London: Bohn, 1847), 337; for the Latin edition, *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi de Gestis Regum Anglorum Libri Quinque*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series (London: Longman, 1887–89), 2: 369–70: “Tunc fluxus crinium, tunc luxus vestium, tunc usus calceorum cum arcuatis aculeis inventus: mollitie corporis certare cum feminis, gressum frangere gestu soluto et latere nudo incedere, adolescentium specimen erat. Enerves, emolliti, quod nati fuerant inviti manebant; expugnatores alienae pudicitiae, prodigi suae. Sequebantur curiam effeminatorum manus et ganeorum greges.”

74. William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, trans. K. R. Potter (London: Nelson, 1955), 6.

75. William of Malmesbury, GPA, 391.

76. Foreville and Leclercq, “Un débat,” 57. The phrase *distortisque pedibus unguatos* likely refers to the Norman practice of wearing the poulaines, which symbolized male potency.

77. *Ibid.*, 100: “parrochialium quis presbiter ecclesiarum, divina compunctus gratia, caste et sobrie in ecclesia conversari, et a coitu et a carnis edulio stramentisque mollioribus et preciosis vestibus abstinere.”

78. *Ibid.*, 85.

79. *Ibid.*, 99, 101–2.

80. *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century*, ed. Richard Morris (London: Early English Text Society, 1873), 162–64.

81. *The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales*, 203.

82. *Ibid.*, 328.

83. Arnulf of Lisieux, *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem Episcopum*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI et XII conscripti*, (hereafter MGH Ldl), ed. E. Dümmler (Hannover: Bibliopolis Hahnianus, 1897), III, 87; see also Carolyn P. Schriber, *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: New Ideas Versus Old Ideals* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 7–9.

84. Arnulf, *Invectiva*, 89; see Schriber, *Dilemma*, 7.

85. Arnulf, *Invectiva*, 89–90; trans. in Schriber, *Dilemma*, 7.

86. Arnulf, *Invectiva*, 90; trans. in Schriber, *Dilemma*, 7.

87. Arnulf, *Invectiva*, 95; trans. in Schriber, *Dilemma*, 8.

88. John Bugge, *Virginitas: An Essay in the History of a Medieval Ideal* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1975).

89. Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch*, 260–73.
90. Klaus van Eickels, “Gendered Violence: Castration and Blinding as Punishment for Treason in Normandy and Anglo-Norman England,” *Gender and History* 16, 3 (November 2004): 588–602, 590.
91. Eleanor Searle, *Predatory Kinship and the Creation of Norman Power, 840–1066* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
92. van Eickels, 592–93.
93. Jorg Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c.1140–c.1230* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 119–20; *The Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, trans. Carolyn P. Schriber (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1997), 101–3.
94. William of Malmesbury, GPA, 230–31.
95. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 267, 273–74.
96. William of Malmesbury, GPA, 230–31.
97. Roger of Howden, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1868), 1:168–69; see also William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs, Book I (Historia Rerum Anglicarum)*, trans. and ed. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy (Wiltshire: Aris and Phillips, 1988), 48–49.
98. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 274.
99. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 166–67. Although I accept Hagen’s translation of the passage for the most part, I translated *viriliter* as “manfully” (not “courageously”) to render a more accurate, gendered meaning in the passage quoted. For the original Latin, see *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Gemma Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. S. Brewer, Rolls Series (London: Longman, 1862), Pars II, 218.
100. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 164, 199. See also John H. Arnold, “The Labour of Continence: Masculinity and Clerical Virginity,” in *Medieval Virginites*, ed. Ruth Evans, Sarah Salih, and Anke Bernau (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), 104–5.
101. Jacqueline Murray, “The law of sin that is in my members: The Problem of Male Embodiment,” in *Gender and Holiness: Men, Women and Saints in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Samantha J. E. Riches and Sarah Salih (London: Routledge, 2002), 9–22.
102. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 187. See also Arnold, “The Labour of Continence,” 107.
103. For a similar analysis, see Erin Sawyer, “Celibate Pleasures: Masculinity, Desire and Asceticism in Augustine,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 6, 1 (July 1995): 1–29.
104. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 177.
105. *Ibid.*, 178. Although I agree largely with Hagen’s translation, he uses the term “courageously” for *viriliter*, which I interpret as “manfully.”
106. *Ibid.*, 179.
107. Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*.
108. Foreville and Leclercq, “Un débat,” 93: “Eia, boni milites, bonum, sicut dicit Apostolus, certamen certantes.”
109. *Ibid.*, 95: “quia fideles, dum in ecclesia virtutes sanctorum virorum et opera viriliter imitari conantur.”
110. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 148, 153–54.
111. *Ibid.*, 159.
112. *Ibid.*, 160–61.
113. *Ibid.*, 162–63.

114. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 1:183.

115. *Ibid.*, 2: 188.

116. *Ibid.*, 2: 244–45.

117. *The Life of Blessed Bernard of Tiron*, 57. See also the Canterbury monks on this position, in Foreville and Leclercq, “Un débat,” 102: “Presbiter igitur femineo pollutus attacktu, qua temeritate ad altare cum Domino confabulatur, quave audacia sacrificaturus ad altare progreditur, qui volens feminea contagione polluitur?”

118. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 150–51. John W. Baldwin, in a widely read and cited essay, argued that Gerald of Wales “left no doubt as to where his own opinions lay. To him, the privilege of clerical marriage was not forbidden in the Scriptures, and the present restrictions only impeded the piety of the clergy.” See John W. Baldwin, “A Campaign to Reduce Clerical Celibacy at the Turn of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries,” in *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel le Bras* (Paris: Sirey, 1965), 2: 1047. Passages such as the ones used in this chapter illustrate concretely that Gerald of Wales was hostile to clerical marriage and felt that there were serious theological and economic issues at stake. It is true that he saw no scriptural precedent for prohibiting clerical marriage, but for matters of “greater purity and integrity” it was essential (*The Jewel of the Church*, 144). See Distinction II, *passim*, for more examples of his opposition to clerical marriage, concubinage, and fornication.

119. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 147.

120. *Ibid.*, 190. I have substituted “manliness” for *viribus*; Hagen uses “powers.”

121. *Ibid.*, 146.

Chapter 2. Legal Discourse and the Reality of Clerical Marriage

1. OV 2: 200–201.

2. Eadmer, *History of Recent Events in England*, 77–78.

3. William of Malmesbury, GPA, 231.

4. C. N. L. Brooke, *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 126–30.

5. See Klaus van Eickels, “Gendered Violence.”

6. Eleanor Searle, *Predatory Kinship*, 226–27.

7. Charlotte Newman, *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), 95, 97.

8. Henry Charles Lea, *A History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1907), 1: 138–42.

9. Brooke, *Medieval Idea of Marriage*, 78–79.

10. *The Life of Herluin*, 69.

11. Geoffrey Grossus, *The Life of Blessed Bernard of Tiron*, 56–58.

12. OV 3:121–23.

13. Newman, 95–97.

14. *Ibid.*, 39–46.

15. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 210.

16. Edward Kealey, *Roger of Salisbury: Viceroy of England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 272.

17. H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 551.

18. Parish, *Clerical Celibacy*, 97; Barstow, *Married Priests*, 55.

19. Parish, 97; Lea, 221–22; *PL* 145:411: “In plenaria synodo Leo papa constituit, ut quaecumque damnabiles feminae intra Romana moenia reperirentur presbyteris prostitutae, ex tunc et deinceps Lateranensi palatio adjudicarentur ancillae.”

20. Barstow, 85–86.

21. *Sacrorum Conciliorum*, ed. Mansi, 20: 433–34.

22. Trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey in *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 219–20.

23. Council of Clermont (1095), Mansi, 20:817: “Ut nullus sacerdos, aut diaconus aut subdiaconus, sed et nullus qui canonicam habet, fornicationis sibi copulam adjungat. Quod si quis federit a canonica omnino arceatur.”

24. Synod of Melfi (1089), canon 12, Mansi, 20:724: “Quod si ab episcopo commoniti non se correxerint, principibus licentiam indulgemus, ut eorum feminas mancipent servituri. Si vero episcopi consenserint eorum pravitibus, ipsi officii interdictione mulcentur.”

25. The reforming synods of 1063, 1064, 1072, 1080, and 1096 were concerned with clerical reform but did not promulgate decrees on lay investiture. See Foreville, “The Synod of the Province of Rouen,” 37.

26. Winchester (1076), Mansi, 20:459; Lisieux (1064) was published by Leopold Delisle, “Canons du Concile tenu à Lisieux en 1064,” *Journal des Savants* (1901): 517; Rouen (1072) is in *Concilia Rotomagensis Provinciae*, ed. Guillaume Bessin (Rouen: Francis Valtier, 1717), 1: 54–57.

27. OV 2: 285–93 is the only description of the canons of Rouen synod 1072, over which John d’Avranches presided, attended by Odo of Bayeux, Michael of Avranches, and Giselebert of Évreux.

28. OV 2: 201.

29. The former position was taken by Parish, 106, and the latter position by Lea, 227.

30. *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. and trans. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 37, 65.

31. *Ibid.*, 135.

32. *Ibid.*, 139.

33. *Ibid.*, 163–65.

34. OV 3: 25–27, for the synod of Lillebonne.

35. Brooke, *Medieval Idea of Marriage*, 84. Brooke asserts Lanfranc had effectively controlled the population of married clerics, until his death. This “heyday” lasted from 1090 to 1130.

36. Mansi 20:1151, canons 5 and 6

37. See Bornstein, “Priests and Villagers in the Diocese of Cortona.”

38. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 2: 242–43.

39. *Ibid.*, 2: 188.

40. *Ibid.*, 2: 244–45.

41. Canons frequently had residences adjacent to their cathedrals; this comment suggests that some also kept manors in the country.

42. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 2: 249. This letter was written in Autumn 1102, suggesting that the clerics had at least a few months to find a suitable replacement.

43. William of Malmesbury, *GPA*, 194–95.

44. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 3: 109.

45. Eadmer, 207–8; *Councils and Synods*, 700–702; Lea, 230–31; Parish, *Clerical Celibacy*, 106–7.

46. Eadmer, 142, 193.

47. *Ibid.*, 228–29.

48. OV 6: 277.

49. OV 6: 291–93. The only version of this event comes from Orderic Vitalis.

50. OV 6: 293.

51. OV 6: 293–95.

52. Another legatine council was held in 1128 at Rouen and passed a general reiteration of the clerical marriage ban; found in OV 6: 389. Marjorie Chibnall asserts that celibacy was so difficult to enforce in Normandy that change had to occur in stages.

53. Henry of Huntingdon, *The History of the English People*, 50.

54. See Nancy Partner, “Henry of Huntingdon: Clerical Celibacy and the Writing of History,” *Church History* 42, 4 (December 1973): 467–75.

55. Henry of Huntingdon, *The History of the English People*, 58. Although Henry states that “this affair was very well known and could not be denied,” he appears to be the original source for the story. The story later appears in the chronicles of Roger of Hoveden and Matthew of Paris.

56. Legatine Council of Westminster (1127), Mansi, 21:356, c.5. These canons show similarities to Anselm’s canons from 1108. See Partner, “Henry of Huntingdon.”

57. Henry of Huntingdon, *The History of the English People*, 61–62.

58. York had a large number of married clergy and will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 3.

59. See Kirsten Fenton’s essay, “Writing Masculinity and Religious Identity in Henry of Huntingdon,” in Cullum and Lewis, eds., *Religious Men and Masculine Identity*, 64–76, 70–71, on Henry’s use of language to denote honorable status.

60. Spear, *Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals*, 90–91. Alan and Roger were likely born before their father became bishop, but it is not known when the third son, Robert, was born. See also Chapter 3 for a discussion of this family.

61. *Ibid.*, 4

62. Brooke, “Gregorian Reform in Action,” 18.

63. See Werner, “Promiscuous Priests.”

64. Julia Barrow-Smith, “Hereford Bishops and Married Clergy, c.1130–1240,” *Historical Research* 60 (1987): 6. The papal mandate came in *Sane de Clericis*, from Alexander III.

65. *The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales*, 356–57.

66. See Brian Kemp, “Hereditary Benefices in the Medieval English Church: A Herefordshire Example,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 43, 107 (May 1970): 1–15.

67. *The Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 210.

68. *Ibid.*, 213; the text of this papal bull can be found in F. Liverani, *Spicilegium Liberianum* (Florence, 1863), 580–81, 580.

69. *The Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 259.

70. *Ibid.*, 260.

71. *Ibid.*, 262.

72. During the late twelfth century, there were likely 38 to 40 canons serving the cathedral. See Schriber, *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 59.

73. *The Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 256.

74. *Ibid.*, 257.

75. *Ibid.*, 271.

76. *Ibid.*, 272.

77. Ibid., 210, for the priest of Vasouy. Rotrou was a member of the powerful Beaumont family and had been a courtier of Henry II. He was appointed bishop of Evreux and then became seneschal and justiciar of the duchy, before his appointment to the archepiscopal see of Rouen. See Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, 75, for more on him.

Chapter 3. The Marginality of Clerical Sons

1. OV 2: 278–79.

2. OV 5: 7–9.

3. For example, Hugh, bishop of Coutances, had a son Roger in the early eleventh century; a full century later, another bishop of Coutance, also named Roger, was married and had a son who served Henry I as chaplain. Roger's public assertion of his birth status comes from his presence in charters where he identified himself as the son of the bishop. See Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 90–91.

4. Throughout this chapter, I use the term "clerical son" to denote all sons of clerics in major orders (priest, deacon, and subdeacon) who also assumed ecclesiastical careers themselves, since they are the focus of this legislation.

5. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 254.

6. Searle, *Predatory Kinship*, 242.

7. Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066–1530* (London: Methuen, 1984), 36–37.

8. Baudot, "Observatoire sur le patronage," 43–44.

9. Orme, 40.

10. P. H. Cullum, "Learning to Be a Man, Learning to Be a Priest in Late Medieval England," in *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*, ed. Sarah Rees-Jones, 135–53 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003) 135–53.

11. John Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945), 103–6.

12. Orme, 45–46.

13. Ibid., 56–57.

14. For examples of uncles assisting nephews in the Loire, see Amy Livingstone, *Out of Love for My Kin: Aristocratic Family Life in the Lands of the Loire, 1000–1200* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010), 39–40.

15. Gerald of Wales, *The Jewel of the Church*, 211, 212.

16. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 273, 278–79; Schriber, *Dilemma*, 1–3; Arnulf's grandfather was Norman the dean of Sées (275).

17. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 175–76, for Hugh of Nonant, 180 for Sylvester; Schriber, *Dilemma*, 58–59.

18. Donald E. Desborough, "Politics and Prelacy in the Late Twelfth Century: the Career of Hugh de Nonant, Bishop of Coventry, 1188–98," *Historical Research* 64, 153 (February 1991): 1–2.

19. *Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 257.

20. Ibid., 280–82.

21. David Spear, "The School of Caen Revisited," *Haskins Society Journal* 4 (1992): 56.

22. Ibid., 63; see also Foreville and Leclercq, "Un débat."

23. Barstow, *Married Priests*, 137.

24. Spear, "School of Caen," 57. Spear reviews the documentary evidence for Gerald and Alfred.

25. See David Bates, "The Character and Career of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux (1049/50–1097)," *Speculum* 50, 1 (January 1975): 12. One must look to the fourteenth-century Norman dioceses to get comparable numbers to eleventh-century Bayeux. See also S. E. Gleason, *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936).

26. For the charter, see *Antiquus Cartularius ecclesiae Baiocensis*, ed. Vivien Bourrienne (Rouen-Paris, 1902), I: no. 22 (hereafter referred to as ACEB, and charters denoted by number); Brooke, "Gregorian Reform," 12n39.

27. For Humphrey Bove, see ACEB, nos. 102, 117, 135, and 149. Humphrey appears as "Unfridus, capellanus," "magistro Hunfrido," and "Unfrido, cancellarius." His son appears in ACEB, no. 96, as "Unfrido Bove, juniore."

28. ACEB, no. 240. For Hugh Bove's claim to his father's prebend, see Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 217, and Peltzer, *Canon Law*, 138. Hugh had obtained a papal exception of holding the prebend; see *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, vol. 4, Salisbury; and Mansi 22: 366.

29. ACEB, no. 149: "Radulfo, filio decani," appears on the witness list of a charter dated 1153; Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 35, 58, 70, 72, and 82.

30. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, vol. 2, St. Paul's, London, 36.

31. Brooke, "Gregorian Reform," 16; Donald Nicholl, *Thurstan, Archbishop of York, 1114–1140* (York: Stonegate Press, 1964), 243–44. Adrian Morey, "Canonist Evidence in the Case of St. William of York," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 10, 3 (1952): 352. Nicholl (7) states that Anger took his family to England, including a daughter, but there is no reference for this daughter. If there was a daughter, this would make sense, since Normans fostered sons through the maternal uncle, in which case Osbert was fostered through his maternal uncle, Thurstan.

32. *The Priory of Hexham: Its Chroniclers, Endowments and Annals*, ed. James Raine (Durham: Surtees Society, 1865), 128–29; Nicholl, 193.

33. *The Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. B. Scott James (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cisterican Publications, 1998), 244–45; Nicholl, 233–34.

34. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 175, 184.

35. *Ibid.*, 96, 101–2, 114, 115, 129.

36. *Ibid.*, 91.

37. *Ibid.*, 136, 140.

38. *Ibid.*, 207, 221; see also Mathieu Arnoux, *Des clercs au service de la réforme: Études et documents sur les chanoines réguliers de la province de Rouen* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 275.

39. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, vol. 6, York. York, as a sister city to Bayeux, had many clerical fathers and their sons who served the cathedral. The archdeacon Durand (c.1093) placed both his sons in the chapter as canons, as did the canon Thomas (c.1142), whose son Paulinus also held a prebend.

40. C. N. L. Brooke, "The Composition of the Chapter of St. Paul's, 1086–1163," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 10, 2 (1951): 121.

41. See *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, vol. 1, St. Paul's, London, 45, 59, 69, 74–75.

42. *Ibid.*, 61, 67–68, 69, 77.

43. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 4.

44. *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. Eleanor Searle (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), 237–45.

45. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 4. Spear does not list the source of the information that confirms the sons were born before Richard became bishop. Richard had been archdeacon of Suffolk from 1116 to 1135, when he was consecrated bishop of Avranches; at that time, he was also serving as chaplain to Henry I. It is possible the sons were born before he became bishop, but it is not conclusive they were born before he was archdeacon.

46. OV 4: 118–19.

47. Eadmer, *History of Recent Events*, 11–12, 17; Thomas is also mentioned in William of Malmesbury, GPA, 390–91.

48. OV 2: 300–301.

49. William of Malmesbury, GPA, 438–41.

50. Eadmer, 77–78. Samson is described in the same passage with Gerard, bishop of Hereford, and neither was a priest at the time of his election. According to Eadmer, one was ordained “deacon and priest, and the other priest,” although he does not specify which is which. If Samson had been a subdeacon, he would have been required to take a vow of chastity. See also V. H. Galbraith, “Notes on the Career of Samson, Bishop of Worcester (1096–1112),” *English Historical Review* 82 (1967): 86–98.

51. Eadmer, 223; Samson had another son who obtained an elite ecclesiastical position. Richard served as canon in the Bayeux chapter before his elevation as bishop of that diocese (1107–33). See Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 44–45, 76, for more on this genealogy.

52. Kealey, *Roger of Salisbury*, 23–24. Roger le Poer, from Caen, became bishop of Salisbury (1107–1139) and was also married with two sons. Roger patronized both his sons and his nephews. His son Roger “the pauper,” born before his father became bishop, became chancellor under King Stephen, and held an archdeaconry; his brother Adelelm also served as an archdeacon and was royal treasurer. His nephews Alexander and Nigel both became bishops. Kealey argues that Adelelm was Roger’s son but that Alexander and Nigel were uniformly described as nephews.

53. See the biographical note by Diana Greenway, ed. and trans., Henry of Huntingdon, *History of the English People*, xiv–xv.

54. See Kathryn Taglia, “On account of scandal . . . : Priests, Their Children and the Ecclesiastical Demand for Celibacy,” *Florilegium* 14 (1995–96): 57–70; Laura Wertheimer, “Children of Disorder: Clerical Parentage, Illegitimacy, and Reform in the Middle Ages,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 15, 3 (July 2006): 382–407; and Karras, *Unmarriages*, 141 respectively for their analysis of clerical children.

55. Karras, *Unmarriages*, 141.

56. Bernhard Schimmelpennig, “Ex fornicatione nati: Studies on the Position of Priests’ Sons from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Century,” *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 2nd ser. 2 (1979): 12–14, discusses the sixth and seventh century legislation that originated in southern Europe.

57. Schimmelpennig, 17–18.

58. Ibid., 18. The canons referenced are canons 8, 19, and 20, of which Schimmelpennig provides a translation. See also Mansi 19: 504, 505. See also Wertheimer’s discussion of this council, in “Children of Disorder,” 393.

59. Schimmelpennig, 19–20. For the canons, see Mansi 20: 498–99, 817–18; for Lateran II (1139), see *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, *Nicea to Lateran V*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 202. Canon 14 from Melfi (Mansi 20: 724): “Presbyterorum filios a sacris altaris ministeriis removendos decern-

imus, nisi aut in coenobiis aut in canonicis religiose probati fuerint conversari." Canon 25 from Clermont: "ne filii presbyterorum, diaconorum vel subdiaconorum canonicorum ad ordines vel alios honores ecclesiasticos promoveantur, nisi monachus vel canonicus fuerit."

60. *Concilia Rotamagensis Provinciae*, ed. Bessin, 47; hereafter noted as Bessin. For a brief discussion of these councils, see Foreville, "Synod of the Province of Rouen," 28–30. For Rouen (1072), see OV 3: 26–27, which is the only extant account of the canons. This synod referenced the canons of Lisieux (1055), which are lost in their entirety.

61. Foreville, "Synod of the Province of Rouen," 31. Synods did not always promulgate the papal decrees passed at ecumenical councils. In 1119, the provincial synod held at Rheims was intended to disseminate the canons of Pope Calixtus II. The synod, however, refused to promulgate canon 2, which forbade lay investiture, because of the large opposition from the attendees.

62. The canons of the Council of Rouen (1096) are not extant but are repeated in OV 5: 18–25, which serves as the only record of the council. Additionally, Chibnall claims that William Bona Anima was present, in contrast to G. H. Williams's claim that he was absent due to his censure; George Williams, *The Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D.* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), 100–114. Foreville, "The Synod of the Province of Rouen," 31, acknowledges that only some of the Clermont canons were promulgated at Rouen in 1096 and suggests that this was not the first time that a Norman synod neglected to promulgate all the ecumenical decrees passed. The Clermont canons are found in Mansi 20: 817–18, canon 25.

63. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 32, for Odo of Bayeux (also OV 6: 378) and 271 for Bona Anima.

64. Williams, *The Norman Anonymous*, 102–25, for a biographical note.

65. The fullest text of the canons of Westminster (1102) are in Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*, 150; canon 8, "Ut filii presbyterorum non sint heredes ecclesiarum patrum suorum"; reprinted in *Councils and Synods*, 675.

66. See the case of Bishop Fulk of Beauvais, c. 1091, who attempted to prevent sacerdotal dynasties and hereditary benefices in his diocese. *Letters of Anselm of Canterbury* 1: 298.

67. Schimmelpfennig, 27. The third party interrupted the direct succession from father to son; thus, there would have been no inheritance of benefice.

68. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 2: 187–88.

69. *Ibid.*, 2: 188. See also Mansi 20: 961–70.

70. *Ibid.*, 2: 289.

71. *Ibid.*, 3: 195.

72. *Ibid.*, 3: 194–95.

73. *Councils and Synods*, 739, 747, 775–76.

74. *Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 257

75. See Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 190, Roger son of Ainus (c.1150s), had a son who was a canon; *ibid.*, 254, Reginald of Neufchatel (c.1170–1184) had sons, although there is no indication they were clerics; *ibid.*, 289, for Hermer (c.1154) and his two sons, John and Roger, all Sées canons.

76. Brooke, "Gregorian Reform in Action," 17–18.

77. Barrow, "Hereford Bishops," 6.

78. PL 202: 1479: "Urbanus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis filiis abbati et conventui Fiscanensi, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Cum a sacris sit canonibus alienum ut in Ecclesiis Dei patri filius, nullo mediante, succedat, nec sanctuarium Dei posit

jure quasi haereditario possideri, mirabile gerimus et indignum quod, in quibusdam ecclesiis monasterio vestro utroque jure subjectis, nonnulli, sicut accepimus, suis parentibus successe-runt, easque contra disciplinam canonicam detinent in scandalum plurimorum.”

79. Taglia, 63. The synodal legislation from Rouen is found in Bessin, 58. The legisla-tion from Coutances is in Mansi 25: 33.

80. Bayeux (Mansi 25: 67); Lisieux (Bessin 2: 484), and Rouen (Mansi 32: 30a).

81. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 2: 188.

82. Schimmelpfennig, 28; Wertheimer, “Children of Disorder,” 405. See also Constance M. Rousseau, “Pope Innocent III and the Familial Relationships of the Clergy,” *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* n.s. 14 (1993): 105–48.

83. *Registres de Alexander IV*, no. 2887, ed. C. Bourel de la Roncière et al., 3 vols. (Paris: Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d’Athènes et de Rome, 1895–1959 [Lisieux 1259]).

84. *Ibid.*, no. 1805 (Bayeux 1257).

85. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 209.

86. David Spear, “Power, Patronage, and Personality in the Norman Cathedral Chapters, 911–1204,” in *Anglo-Norman Studies* XX, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, 205–22 (Wood-bridge: Boydell, 1998), 218; also Crosby, *The King’s Bishop*, 274–77.

87. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 2: 245–46.

88. *Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 150.

89. *Ibid.*, 151.

90. *Ibid.*, 177–78.

91. *Ibid.*, 261.

92. *Ibid.*

93. *Ibid.*

94. Desborough, “Politics and Prelacy,” 11–14. Desborough includes three charters that indicate that Hugh had a son named Philip. M. J. Franklin, editor of *English Episcopal Acta* 16: *Coventry and Lichfield, 1160–1182* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), xxvii, as-serts, without addressing Desborough’s article, that this *filius episcopi* was the son of Bishop Richard Peche, the previous bishop of Coventry (1160–82); he uses the same charter as Desborough. The foundation of Desborough’s claim is that there are three charters that can be dated to the 1188–1189 period, based on the presence of two witnesses; this would elimi-nate Richard Peche as the bishop in question. Nonetheless, there is a bishop’s son listed in the charters, which supports my assertions that clerical sons did not suddenly vanish overnight.

95. Spear, *Personnel of Norman Cathedrals*, 176, 176n.25.

Chapter 4. “The Natural Right of a Man”: The Clerical Defense of Traditional Masculinity

1. John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 399–401. I have slightly modified Boswell’s translation by rendering *mollis* as “effeminate.” This poem is titled “We Married Clergy” (*Nos uxorati*). Boswell pin-points the writing to the twelfth or thirteenth century, but I would suggest an earlier period, before 1150, due to the language of the poem, which suggests married clerics could still iden-tify as such. Boswell’s dating of the poem is likely due to its placement in a thirteenth-century manuscript, housed in Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 17212).

2. More recently, Elisabeth van Houts and Rolf Lenzen have asserted that this poem was written by Serlo of Bayeux. Lenzen has identified the author on the basis of the poem’s

common passages with one of Serlo's known poems, *Defensio pro filiis presbyterorum*. In particular, *Nos uxorati* shares two very similar verses with *Defensio*, which leads Lenzen to identify Serlo as the author of both. See Elisabeth van Houts, "The Fate of Priests' Sons in Normandy with Special Reference to Serlo of Bayeux (d. after 1105/6)," *Haskins Society Journal* 25 (2013): 96–139; and Rolf Lenzen, "Sodomitenschelte: Eine Invektive des Serlo von Bayeux?" in *Arbor amoena comis*, ed. Ewald Konsgen (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1990), 189–92.

3. Murray, "Masculinizing Religious Life"; Karras, "Thomas Aquinas's Chastity Belt," 52–67. For continence as a performance of manliness, see Arnold, "The Labor of Continence," 102–18.

4. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 244.

5. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 194, for Lateran I (1123), canon 21.

6. Anne Barstow's *Married Priests and the Reforming Papacy: The Eleventh-Century Debates* (1982) has examined the debate over clerical marriage in Europe as a whole, focusing on this debate as the most pressing issue of the reform agenda. More recently, Erwin Frauenknecht's *Die Verteidigung der Priesterehe in der Reformzeit* (Hannover: Hansche Buchhandlung, 1997) analyzed in great detail the origin of several pro-clerical marriage documents, including the ones under discussion here, and produced new editions to replace those appearing in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. What has not yet been examined is how these pro-clerical marriage documents reflect the debate over the intersection of religious identity, sexuality, and masculinity.

7. Barstow attributes the *Rescripta* to Ulric of Imola (*Married Priests*, 107). Frauenknecht argues for a different origination (*Die Verteidigung*, 70).

8. Frauenknecht, 70.

9. Barstow, 107–20. She asserts that the *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio* and the *Treatise on Grace* were both influenced by the *Rescripta*. The original document, *Pseudo-Udalrici Epistola de Continentia Clericorum*, is published in MGH Ldl, I: 244–60, and in Frauenknecht, 203–15.

10. See Frauenknecht, 12–34, for an extensive discussion on this subject.

11. For the sake of simplicity, I have adopted Anne Barstow's title for this work, for which the incipit is "*cum sub liberi arbitrii potestate creati simus*," as shown in Erwin Frauenknecht's edition.

12. The dates and authorship of the *Treatise on Grace* and the *Tractatus* have recently been questioned. Barstow has provided a date of 1075 for the *Treatise on Grace*, while Frauenknecht has argued for a later date in the 1120s. I place the document in the range 1102–1110, due to its common elements with the Norman Anonymous tracts. The Norman Anonymous J22/26 tract has been dated to 1096 and considered a response to the Council of Rouen, which disseminated the Council of Clermont decrees. Yet the Rouen council did not promulgate the decrees on priests' sons. It is more likely the J22/26 tracts were written after 1102, possibly even later in the twelfth century.

13. Tanner, 191, 198. Lateran II, canons 7, 21; Lateran III, canons 6, 7.

14. Brigitte Meijns, "Opposition to Clerical Continence and the Gregorian Celibacy Legislation in the Diocese of Thèrouanne: *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio* (c.1077–1078)," *Sacris Erudiri* 47 (2008): 281; Barstow, 116, claims, as does Auguste Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1924–25), that he was an Italian cleric living in Normandy.

15. Frauenknecht and Meijns have both posited theories of origin. Frauenknecht has allowed for the possibility of the document's being produced in either the archdiocese of Sens or Rouen, while Meijns has offered a radically different theory, that it was produced in

the diocese of Théroutanne. Meijns has a strong argument, but it is largely circumstantial and based on the letters written by the clerics of Cambrai and Noyon, presumably in response to the *Tractatus*, and in which the clerics refer to their “neighbors.” These “neighbors” are as likely to be the neighboring diocese of Rouen or the diocese of Théroutanne or the neighboring principality of Normandy, next to France. Given the amount of conclusive evidence for a strong resistance to celibacy within the archdiocese of Rouen, it is as likely that this document originated there, if not on its borders, as it is that it was produced within the diocese of Théroutanne. I find no evidence, however, to support Barstow’s assertion that the tract was written by an Italian living in Normandy.

16. See Frauenknecht, 138–43, where he argues for a later dating of the tract, as late as 1129. He also asserts that the author’s use of free will and grace was not necessarily connected to Anselm but that many theologians employed such concepts.

17. Williams, *The Norman Anonymous*.

18. Anne Barstow has made this assertion; see *Married Priests*, 157–61. The Electronic Norman Anonymous Project (ENAP) has offered a different interpretation, one I accept. See <http://normananonymous.org/ENAP>.

19. Frauenknecht, 254.

20. *Ibid.*, 254, 265.

21. *Ibid.*, 263.

22. See McLaughlin, “The Bishop as Bridegroom,” for further discussion of this imagery.

23. Norman Anonymous, J25, ENAP. The author also refutes it in J24, a treatise on episcopal and royal consecration.

24. Anonymous of York, MGH Ldl, III, 646: “Sed quod Deus hoc instituerit, nec in veteri testamento nec in euangelio nec in apostolorum epistolis scriptum repperitur, in quibus quicquid Deus hominibus precepit, insertum describitur. Traditio igitur hominis est, non Dei, non apostolorum institutio. Quoniam et apostolus instituit, ut oportet episcopum esse unius uxoris virum [1. Tim. 3.2]” The *Tractatus* author also uses the same passages; see Frauenknecht, 258.

25. James A. Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 95, 183.

26. Serlo of Bayeux, *Defensio pro filiis presbyterorum*, in MGH Ldl III, 579–83, here at 580.

27. Frauenknecht, 258.

28. *Ibid.*, 255.

29. See the ENAP for J22 and J26 editions with commentary on added passages.

30. Frauenknecht, 277: “Quid est propter instantem necessitatem? Quae est necessitas instans, nisi infirmitas presens?”

31. Anonymous of York, MGH Ldl, III, 646.

32. Trans. in Barstow, 119; Latin version in Frauenknecht, 271.

33. Frauenknecht, 274–75

34. Anonymous of York, MGH Ldl, III, 646.

35. *Ibid.*: “Hac itaque eos lege captivante, et carnis concupiscentia stimulante, aut fornicari coguntur aut nubere. Quorum quid melius sit, apostolica docemur auctoritate, qua dicitur: *Melius nubere, quam uri.*”

36. Translated by Barstow, 121.

37. Kirsten Fenton has more recently found a similar connection in Henry of Huntingdon’s *History of the English People*, in which the writer made an intentional distinction be-

tween lawful wives (*uxors*) and whores. See “Writing Masculinity and Religious Identity in Henry of Huntingdon.”

38. *Frauenknecht*, 260–61.

39. *Ibid.*, 263.

40. *Letter of the Clergy of Cambrai*, trans. John S. Ott; *Cameracensium et Noviomensium clericorum epistolae*, MGH Ldl, III, 574. I am indebted to John Ott for allowing me to cite his excellent translation.

41. Trans. Ott; original Latin in MGH Ldl, III, 576.

42. Trans. Ott; MGH Ldl, III, 576.

43. Anonymous of York, MGH Ldl, III, 648.

44. See Pauline Stafford's argument in “The Meanings of Hair in the Anglo-Norman World,” 163; Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century*, 141.

45. On sodomy accusations as a discursive tool, see Richard E. Zeikowitz, *Homoeroticism and Chivalry: Discourses of Male Same-Sex Desire in the Fourteenth Century* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), chaps. 6 and 7; and Vern Bullough, “Postscript: Heresy, Witchcraft and Sexuality,” in Bullough and Brundage, eds., *Sexual Practices and the Medieval Church*, 206–11.

46. Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society*, 473.

47. *Frauenknecht*, 274.

48. In fact, the Norman Anonymous argues in J3 that sodomy is not the most harmful transgression in the Bible, and that as such it does not necessarily deserve capital punishment. See ENAP for this argument.

49. Anonymous of York, MGH Ldl, III, 647.

50. *Ibid.*, 648: “ipsi facere nuptiarum fructum appetunt.”

51. *Frauenknecht*, 254, 258.

52. *Letter of the Clergy of Cambrai*, trans. Ott, 573–78.

53. Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, 399–400. I have changed Boswell's translation for *semivir et mollis* from “half-man, debauchee” to “half-man, an effeminate,” which I think more closely expresses the sentiment of the passage.

54. See Boswell's argument, 215–16, that the decrees were never promulgated because they violated papal directives against harsh punishment of sodomites; as the foundation of his argument, he points out that John of Salisbury never mentions the laws.

55. Eadmer, *History of Recent Events*, 152; Mansi, 20:1152.

56. William of Malmesbury, GPA, 194–95.

57. Bruce O'Brien, “R. W. Southern, John Boswell, and the Sexuality of Anselm,” in *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, ed. Mathew Kuefler (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 167–78. O'Brien recounts the argument between Boswell and Sir Richard Southern on the subject of Anselm's homosexuality.

58. *The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*, 2:249.

59. *The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga*, ed. and trans. Edward M. Goulburn and Henry Symonds (Oxford: James Parker, 1878), 157.

60. Barstow, 133, asserts that Serlo was deprived of his benefice when Henry I conquered Bayeux in 1105. This is not accurate. The more recent research of Elisabeth van Houts indicates that he was a canon when he died, as it was listed in the mortuary rolls of Vital, abbot of Savigny. See van Houts, “The Fate of the Priests' Sons in Normandy,” 107. In van Houts's previous article, “Latin Poetry and the Anglo-Norman Court, 1066–1135: The Carmen de Hastingae Proelio,” *Journal of Medieval History* 15 (1989): 39–62, she asserted

he was from the village of Bretteville-sur-Odon. She has now revised this thesis and asserts Serlo's origins are still in doubt.

61. *Les actes de Guillaume le Conquérant et de la reine Mathilde pour les abbayes Caennaises*, ed. Lucien Musset (Caen: Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 1967), 64, 75; also van Houts, "Latin Poetry and the Anglo-Norman Court," 44, 58n16.

62. Both poems have been published by A. Boutemy, "Deux poèmes inconnu de Serlon de Bayeux et une copie nouvelle de son poème contre les moines de Caen," *Moyen Âge* 41 (1938): 241–67, who makes a strong case that both were written by Serlo. It is not clear, however, that the poems were directed against actual knights. It is possible that the term *miles* was used metaphorically to describe the monks of Caen; it was fairly typical for monks to describe themselves as warriors of God. For Serlo to employ the same terminology may have been his way of hiding the identity of his perpetrators, which he felt comfortable disclosing at a later date.

63. *Ibid.*, 245, ll.17, 18, 33, 35.

64. van Houts, "Latin Poetry and the Anglo-Norman Court," 58n16; David Spear, "William Bona Anima, Abbot of St. Stephen's of Caen, 1070–9," *Haskins Society Journal* 1 (1989): 52–54.

65. Spear, "William Bona Anima," 58. Papal privilege in *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. P. Jaffé (Leipzig, 1885), no. 4644.

66. *The Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century*, ed. Thomas Wright, Rolls Series 59 (London: Longman, 1872), 202–4, and *passim*.

67. *Ibid.*, 252: "Nullus in orbe Dei tantae fuit ingluviei / . . . puerpera fies. Molem ventre geris quam praegnans esse videris. . . . Femina nubendo fit praegnans, tu comedendo."

68. Elisabeth van Houts has conjectured that Serlo wrote the poem after accompanying Odo of Bayeux to the Council of Clermont. Serlo likely would not have known the decrees of the council without being personally present, since Clermont's canons were not disseminated in Normandy. See van Houts, "The Fate of Priests' Sons in Normandy," 105.

69. Serlo of Bayeux, *Defensio*, MGH Ldl, III, 581: "Nunc homines vite turpis, mechi, sodomite / Et qui furta patrant, in nos obprobria latrant / Vel bene moratos, et despiciunt male natos: / Lex premit ista bonos et sublevat ad mala pronos. . . . Quid pena vitas urgere gravi sodomitas?" I have translated these passages myself, considering that Barstow's translation of this passage, which, while generally accurate, obscures key components that I have clarified.

70. Trans. Barstow, 134.

71. Serlo of Bayeux, *Defensio*, MGH Ldl, III, 581: "Cur reprobando premit quem Christus morte redemit?"

72. *Ibid.*, 581.

73. *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio*, in Frauenknecht, 265. When possible, I have used Meijns's translation. For the sake of my analysis, however, I occasionally modify her translation to reflect more accurately the spirit of the author's words.

74. Trans. Brigitte Meijns, in "Opposition to Clerical Continence," 237; original Latin in Frauenknecht, 265.

75. Trans. Meijns, 237.

76. Frauenknecht, 263: "Adest vero vel pertinatia pervicaciam, nec minori insipientia predicant filios clericorum ad sacros ordines promoveri vel quolibet ecclesiastico honore sublimari."

77. *Ibid.*, 266: "Vos ergo filii catholice ecclesie qui eretice fraudis pravitate pollui respuitis, nolite timere eos."

78. OV 6: 276–77. Canon 4 specified that “no bishop, no priest, no member whatsoever of the clergy shall bequeath ecclesiastical offices or benefices to anyone as if by hereditary right.”

79. Foreville and Leclercq, “Un débat,” 52–53. Thibaud’s heightened level of polemic in this letter has been noted already by Nicholl, *Thurstan*, 188–89.

80. *Theobaldi Stampensis Epistola ad Roscelinum*, MGH Ldl, III, 604: “In decretis namque Calixti papae legendo invenimus, et inveniendū legimus: ‘Si quis praedicat sacerdotam post lapsum carnis per poenitentiam ad sacerdotalem dignitatem redire non posse, fallitur, nec catholice sentit.’”

81. *Ibid.*, III, 605: “Sic ergo cujuscunque generis sit ille novus homo in utero generatur Ecclesiae.”

82. *Ibid.*, 606: “Filii namque sacerdotum non ideo quod sint exleges refutantur, sicut imperiti homines arbitrantur, sed ut sacerdotes a concupiscentiis carnis refrenentur.” Also, “Quod prohibetur ne filii sacerdotum ad ordines promoveantur, sic est intelligendum secundum Augustinum, eos, qui hanc prohibitionem audiunt, ab hujusmodi concupiscentiis abstinere debere.”

83. *Ibid.*: “Si enim filius sacerdotis honeste vivit, ordinandus est. Si vero militis filius inhoneste vivit, repudiandus est.”

84. *Ibid.*, 605: “Si ergo ex eodem Patre, et ex eodem sanctae matris Ecclesiae utero sumus omnes.”

85. *Letters of the Clergy of Cambrai and Noyon*, trans. Ott.

86. *Cameracensium et Noviomensium clericorum epistolae*, MGH Ldl, III, 576–77.

87. *Theobaldi Stampensis Epistola Ad Roscelinum*, in *ibid.*, 605.

88. Both J22 and J26 can be accessed at the Electronic Norman Anonymous Project (ENAP), <http://normananonymous.org/>. The printed document can be found in *Apologia pro filiis sacerdotum*, MGH Ldl III, 649–55.

89. *Apologia pro filiis sacerdotum*, MGH Ldl III, 650: “Parentes quippe non sunt auctores generationis filiorum, sed ministri. Si legitime ministrant, suum bonum est, non filiorum. Si non legitime, suum malum est, non filiorum.”

90. *Ibid.*, 649: “Quod ideo faciunt, ut desinant homines fornicari et mundioris vite, vestigiis ambulent, quibus ad regnum celorum expeditius pervenire valeant, quasi non possunt alie vie reperiri et quidem faciliores et magis idonee, quibus id effici possit. Sed cur non similiter iudicant de filiis homicidarum et furum?”

91. *Ibid.*, 651: “ut qui ex legitimo coniugio baptizantur, sint vasa ire . . . et qui ex non legitimo baptizantur, sint vasa misericordie.” See also Barstow’s discussion, 167.

92. *Ibid.*, 650: “Non tamen illos creat de turpitudine vitiorum, sed de fecunditate seminum, non de corruptionis feditate, sed de seminali bono nature, quod vere legitimum est.”

93. *Ibid.*: “Utrique etenim equaliter pereunt, si non eis fuerit sacri baptismi remedium salutari subventum.”

94. *Ibid.*, 651: “Nam qui filium inhonorat, Deum patrem inhonorat.”

95. *Ibid.*: “Caveant igitur, qui tales ad ordines recipere nolunt et contempnunt, ne Deum potius spernant vel inhonorent, qui in ipsis et recipitur et spernitur.”

96. *Ibid.*, 652: “Et qui hanc a sacerdotio reicit, novum homines reicit, qui secundum Deum creatus est in iusticia et sanctitate veritatis . . . quem quisque baptizatus indutus est.”

97. *Ibid.*, 655: “Sed fortasse dicturus es: Lex canonum prohibet, ut tales ordinentur. . . . Quia ergo tales spiritu Dei ducuntur, et illi secundum legem canonum non sunt, sed illi, qui spiritu non ducuntur et illi secundum legem canonum ordinari prohibentur.”

98. *An liceat sacerdotibus inire matrimonium*, *ibid.*, 647: “Parentes non sunt auctores creationis filiorum, sed ministri.”

99. *Ibid.*: “Nam etiam, ut videtur, minime credunt, quod de sacerdotum filiis assumat Deus ad edificandum supernam civitatem.”

100. *Ibid.*: “Quicumque ergo id efficere contatur, ut non faciat Deus in opere, que fecit in predestinatione, ipsam predestinationem Dei conatur evacuare.” The ideas on the repopulation of angels come from Anselm’s *Cur Deus Homo*, Book I, chap. 16.

101. *An liceat sacerdotibus inire matrimonium*, MGH Ldl III, 47: “Nichil enim inordinate facit.”

Chapter 5. “They ought to be a model and example”: The Expansion of Religious Manliness

1. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Tanner, 197–98.

2. See Raymonde Foreville, “La réception des conciles généraux dans l’église et la province de Rouen au XIII^e siècle,” in *Gouvernement et vie de l’église au Moyen Âge* (London: Variorum, 1979), 243–53, for the intersection between the pastoral revolution of the thirteenth century and the increase in councils and synods in Normandy.

3. See Marion Gibbs and Jane Lang, *Bishops and Reform, 1215–72: With Special Reference to the Lateran Council of 1215* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 113–58; Tanner, 237.

4. There is a dispute over exactly how much power was left to the chapters. See John W. Baldwin, “Philip Augustus and the Norman Church,” *French Historical Studies* 6, 1 (Spring 1969): 1–30; and Daniel Power, “The Norman Church and the Angevin and Capetian Kings,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56, 2 (April 2005): 205–34.

5. Willliell R. Thomson, *Friars in the Cathedral: The First Franciscan Bishops, 1226–1261* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute, 1975), 76; also Crosby, *King’s Bishop*, 275–77.

6. C. R. Cheney, *Episcopal Visitations on Monasteries in the Thirteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1931), 8–10, discusses the unique aspects of Odo’s register.

7. *Concilia Rotomagensis Provinciae*, ed. Bessin, 1:94–98

8. Quoted in Schmitt, “The Ethics of Gesture,” 139, 142. Schmitt’s wider argument can be found in his *La raison des gestes dans l’Occident médiéval* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), 199–203.

9. Schmitt, “The Ethics of Gesture,” 142.

10. Bessin, 1:110: “Praecipimus etiam ut sint in habitu, et gestu, et conversatione honesta.”

11. Tanner, 242–43.

12. Bessin, 1:130–32.

13. *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, 2 vols., ed. Pietro Pressuti, 2 vols. (Rome: Verlag, 1978), 4150, 4601, 5179.

14. Bessin, 1:135. This is canon 11.

15. *Les Status Synodaux Françaises du XIII^e siècle précèdes de l’historique du synode diocésain depuis ses origines: Les statuts de Paris et le synodal de l’Ouest (XIII^e siècle)*, ed. and trans. Odette Pontal (Paris: Bibiothèque Nationale, 1976), 1: 127–37, 137: “et cum per talia auctoritas prelationis viliscat, et nonnumquam ex hiis contingat periculum corporale.”

16. For detailed biographies on the thirteenth-century archbishops of Rouen, see

Tabbagh, *Diocèse de Rouen*, 77–87; for their roles in reforming councils, see Foreville, “The Synod of Rouen” and “La réception des conciles généraux.”

17. Davis, *Holy Bureaucrat*, 122–24.

18. *Ibid.*, 38.

19. Eudes of Rouen, *Register*, ed. Jeremiah O’Sullivan, trans. Sydney Brown (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 92–93, 99–100, 107–8, 275, 276–77; hereafter noted as RER. Lisieux was an ongoing issue (RER, 70 and *passim*). For instance, Odo began in January 1248 with a visitation of all deaneries in the archdeaconries of Eu and the Petit-Caux; there are no other records for visitation of these deaneries until 1258. However, there is some indication that Odo may have used a second register, which has never been found.

20. Thomson, 86–88; Davis, *Holy Bureaucrat*, 52–63.

21. *Regestrum visitationum archiepiscopi Rothomagensis*, ed. Th. Bonnin (Rouen: Bru-net, 1852), 62, 297; hereafter noted as Bonnin.

22. *Les Registres de Grégoire IX: Recueil des bulles de ce pape*, vol. 1, ed. Lucien Auvray (Paris: Librairie de Thorin et fils, 1896), 938–39: “dum clerici detinere presumunt publice concubinas, et frequenter Gyezi et Simonis vices dampnata cupiditate supplentes, irreverenter de spiritualibus mercimonia contrahunt interdicta.”

23. Davis, *Holy Bureaucrat*, 123.

24. RER, xxxii.

25. Davis, *Holy Bureaucrat*, 122–26.

26. This was largely the case well into the later Middle Ages. See Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); for more on Franciscan preaching, see David d’Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris Before 1300* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); for the late twelfth century, Jean Longère, *Oeuvres oratoires de maîtres parisiens au XIIIe siècle: Étude historique et doctrinale*, 2 vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1975).

27. “Trois sermons synodaux de la collection attribuée à Jean de la Rochelle,” ed. Louis Duval-Arnould, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 69, 3–4 (1976): 336–400; 70, 1–2 (1977): 35–71. These sermons were originally attributed to Odo’s master, Jean de la Rochelle. A reference in the last sermon led the scholar Louis Duval-Arnould to date the sermon to 1250, five years after de la Rochelle had died. This factor, along with the notation “*sermo in synodo Rothomagensi*,” has led to a reidentification of authorship of all three sermons to Odo Rigaldus.

28. Longère, 381–86. Many late twelfth-century writers emphasized fidelity as a requisite quality for pastoral work.

29. Duval-Arnould, 40–44.

30. *Ibid.*, 40: “Primo ergo requiritur ut sit fidelis servus in timendo. . . . Vulvam matris Ecclesiae dicit paenitentiam vel baptismum, per quam generantur Deo filii spirituals. Illi ergo sunt fideles servi qui a tempore suae paenitentiae vel baptismi habent in se timorem Domini . . . ad hoc autem exigitur timor, ut non sint negligentes in servitio domini sui; quia, sicut dicitur Eccle. VII, *qui timet Deum nihil negligit*.”

31. *Ibid.*: “Secundo probatur fidelitas servi erga dominum suum in oboediendo praeceptis domini sui. . . . Generi regis Christi sunt sacerdotes, qui desponsaverunt filiam regis, id est parochiam.”

32. *Ibid.*, 44: “Fidelitas autem in persona comprobatur in tribus, scilicet in abdicacione cupiditatis, in mansuetudine humilitatis, in continentia castitatis.”

33. Ibid., 46: "Unde Apostolus, informans Timotheum episcopum et alios in ipso, dicebat, II Tim. II: *Servum Dei non oportet litigare, sed mansuetum esse ad omnes*. Sed heu! multi sunt qui volunt cum austeritate et superbia dominari; unde dicit Dominus pastoribus Israel, Ez. XXIV: *Cum austeritate imperabatis ovibus meis, et cum potentia*."

34. Ibid., 43: "Quarto probatur fidelitas servi in custodiendo. Quae maxime debet esse sacerdotum quibus commissa est cura animarum et custodia."

35. Ibid., 44: "Sed multi non sunt hodie dispensatores, sed potius dissipatores, qui significantur per villicum illum. . . . Tales sunt illi qui expedunt superflue bona illa quae debent pauperibus erogare."

36. There were many decrees from the period of reform that forbade parishioners to receive the sacraments from a fornicating priest; see Barstow, *Married Priests*, 53.

37. Duval-Arnould, 46: "Tertio comprobatur fidelitas praelati in continentia castitatis . . . Et ista fidelitas maxime debet esse in sacerdotibus, qui accedunt cotidie ad altare. Sed heu! hodie potest dici de multis quod dicitur Soph. III de prophetis: *Prophetae eius vesani, viri infideles; sacerdotes eius polluerunt sanctum*."

38. Ibid., 47: "Civitas fidelis, plena iudicii, debet esse Ecclesia vel parochia commissa sacerdotibus, in qua fideliter debent iudicare peccata. Sed hodie propter exempla sacerdotum sit Ecclesia vel parochia quasi scortum, quia, cum ipsi sint fornicarii publici, non audent iudicare vel arguere unum fornicarium; et ideo, *quomodo facta est meretrix civitas quae deberet esse plena iudicii*?"

39. Ibid., 56–57: "Ministerium ad proximum quadruplex est: curare, pascere, colere, aedificare. Curare, quia medici sunt sacerdotes . . . pascere, quia pastores sunt . . . colere vero, quia agricolae sunt . . . aedificare, quia architecti sunt."

40. Ibid., 58–59: "Secundum hoc ergo determinatur sacerdotale ministerium secundum dispensationem ad proximum in curando medicina confessionis, in pascendo verbo praedicationis, in colendo distributione sacramentalis communionis, in aedificando exemplo sanctae conversationis."

41. Ibid., 55: "Item mundum oportet ipsum esse ad offerendum divinum sacrificium. Quod figuratum fuit Ex. XXVIII, ubi dictum fuit de sacerdotibus: *Faciant femoralia lineae ut operiant carnem turpitudinis suae*. Per femoralia designatur continentia castitatis. Et I R. II dicitur quod *Samuel ministrabat ante Dominum accinctus ephod lineo*; ephod lineum significat munditiam castitatis; lineum enim vestimentum per multas concussionem pervenit ad candorem: sic homo per multas afflictiones carnis pervenit ad munditiam castitatis."

42. Ibid.: "In hoc quod *offeritis panem pollutum super altare meum*. Super quem locum dicit Hieronymus: 'panem caelestem corpus Christi quantum in se est polluit, qui ad altare indignus accedit'."

43. Ibid., 59: "Fidelis in dispensatione sacramentalis communionis . . . haec autem fidelitas est ut in hoc quaeratur honor Dei et salus proximi, non aliquid temporales, sicut faciunt cupidi et simoniaci sacerdotes, qui etiam intentione pecuniae et lucri temporalis celebrant missas et exsequias mortuorum et nuptias contrahentium et huiusmodi."

44. Ibid., 52: "Primum impedit gulae voluptas et luxuria, quae inducunt negligentiam, sicut patet in filiis Heli."

45. Ibid., 60. See also Davis's discussion of this passage, *Holy Bureaucrat*, 126.

46. Duval-Arnould, 61–65.

47. Ibid., 69: "in leproso, qui anhelitu corrumpit et inficit, significatur immunditia locutionis in verbis contumeliae vel scurrilitatis, propter quam praecipiebatur, Lev XIII, quod leprosus haberet *os veste contextum* et expelleretur *extra castra*," and "In fluxu seminis significatur immunditia renum luxuriosae libidinis." It was commonly believed that semen originated

in the brain and traveled through the kidneys. See Cadden, *The Meanings of Sex Difference*, 15, 55, and 180. Instead of translating *renum* as “kidneys,” I have rendered it “loins,” which conveys the deeper meaning of the passage in a better fashion.

48. Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, 116–17.

49. Duval-Arnould, 69–71: “In Nadab igitur et Abiu figuratur damnatio sacerdotum propter immunditiam cordis in prava concupiscentia voluntatis, quae significatur per ignem alienum. In percussione Alcimi, qui verbo suo intendebat destruere opera prophetarum, significatur damnatio sacerdotum propter immunditiam locutionis in vitio scurrilitatis et pravae suggestionis, per quam aedificatio praedicatorum in populo destruitur. In percussione filiorum Heli, damnatio sacerdotum propter immunditiam gulositatis. In percussione Ozae, damnatio sacerdotum propter immunditiam renum et libidinis.”

50. Ibid., 65: “Unde et propter negligentiam correptionis reprobatus fuit Heli ab officio sacerdotali, I R. II, quia audivit *quomodo filii eius dormiebant cum mulieribus quae excubabant ad ostium tabernaculi*, et neglexit. Quod est valde terribile episcopo negligenti corrigere luxuriam sacerdotum.”

51. Ibid.: “Hinc est quod indicitur sobrietas sacerdotibus ut non turbetur eorum ratio in iudicio, Lev. X: *Vinum et omne quod inebriare potest non bibetis quando intrabitis in tabernaculum testimonii, ne moriamini, quia praeceptum est sempiternum in generationibus vestris*. . . . Sed heu hodie! propter illud Ez. XXII: *Sacerdotes contempserunt legem meam et polluerunt sanctuaria mea; inter sanctum et profanum non habuerunt distantiam*.”

52. Ibid., 70: “Sacerdotes igitur qui accedunt ad Dominum sanctificantur ab immunditia cogitationis, locutionis, ventris et renum.”

53. The sermon is edited by Jacques-Guy Bougerol, “Un sermon inédit d’Eudes Rigaud,” *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 62 (1995): 343–58. See also Davis, *Holy Bureaucrat*, 174–76, for a different take on this sermon.

54. Bougerol, 357: “Ita et nos exemplo eius carnales delicias deberemus fugere, sicut fecit Joseph cui dixit illa: Dormi mecum; et ipse, relicto pallio in manibus eius, fugit foras. Fugite fornicationem, dicit Apostolus, prima ad Corinthios. Nunquam melius vincuntur motus est temptationes carnes quam fugiendo, non sic reluctando? Si occurret tibi homo totus merdoso et vellet luctari tecum, quid facere deberes nisi fugere ab eo, nam luctari cum eo non posses quin te ipsum inquinares. Sic autem est de temptatione carnis quod nunquam venit quin hominem aliquantulum inquinet; feda est et fedat illum quem tangit.”

55. Ibid.: “Filia regis erat delicata et tenera puella, erat dives et potens et posset habere nobilissimum sponsum si voluisset, sed omnia fugit et vero sponso Christo coniugi concupivit.”

56. Ibid., 351: “Aliquando enim sit tale bellum pro adeptione honoris aut tuitionem iam adepti.”

57. Ibid., 351–52: “Secunda causa quare sit tale bellum est pro possessionibus adipiscendis et recuperandis. . . . Sit etiam tertio ad proprie vite defensionem et tuitionem, quod est rationabilius, nisi quod mala radice hoc proveniat ex aliqua mala libidine. . . . Quarto, sit aliquando tale bellum pro expetenda ulcione, quod est bellum nequicie et iniquitatis.”

58. Ibid., 355: “Id est novus homo Christus ista bella introduxit ut sic igitur a novo homine Christo sunt introducta ut sic homines pugnent, item dicuntur nova, quia hominem innovant.”

59. Ibid., 353: “Sic sumus in multiplici bello et omnes sunt in isto bello, et boni et mali; sed mali videntur non intelligere bellum istud quia permittunt se capi et trahi ad voluntatem adversarii; in nullo ei resistunt. Illi autem qui bellum istud intelligent et attendant sunt iusti, qui viriliter pugnant contra tria predicta, mundum, carnem et dyabolum.”

60. Ibid., 353–54: “Pugnare enim debemus primo contra dyabolum semper . . . Item dyabolus deceptit nos per mundum, per res mundi et capit nos in eis, sicut in muscipula capitur mus quando credit comedere escam; ita facit dyabolus quod escat hamum et homo videns escam et non hamum, non laqueum aut deceptionem dyaboli, sic capitur ab eo et levatur in hamo eius.”

61. Paul’s letter to the Galatians, 4: 21–31, retells the significance of the son born of Hagar, the servant to Abraham, and Isaac, the legitimate son, born of Abraham and Sarah. Ishmael, Hagar’s son, was born in the “ordinary” way, while Isaac was born of a promise made by God.

62. Bougerol, 354: “Item est bellum grave nobis contra carnem. Gravis est iste hostis et periculosus, gravis est pugna cum eo et periculosa quia domesticus est hostis et nulla pestis efficacior ad nocendum quam familiaris et domesticus inimicus. . . . Iste hostis continue impugnat nos, quia continua est pugna, continuum bellum carnis ad spiritum; propter quod dicit Apostolus ad Galatas 4: *Et quomodo tunc is qui carnem natusest persequeretur eum qui secundum spiritum, ita nunc* quasi continuum est bellum inter carnem et spiritu et ideo oportet nos iugiter contra carnem pugnare et bellum habere cum divino adiutorio, aliter subcumberemus.”

63. Ibid., 357: “Istud deberent attendere clerici seculares iuvenes, bene vestiti et bene pasti, quando vadunt ad spectacula ut videant mulieres, et eciam quando redeunt ad patriam suam, quia multi in scholis caste vivunt, qui ibi totum in momento citissime amittunt. Ista non sic fecit, sed carnis delicias fugit et castitatem virginalem custodivit.”

Chapter 6. Policing Priestly Bodies: The Conflict of Masculinities Among the Norman Parish Clergy

1. RER, 33. The penalty mentioned is not found in the register.

2. O’Sullivan, editor of Eudes’s *Register* (RER, xxxiii) asserted that *infamia* meant loss of one’s good name among one’s peers and could indicate that an investigation or trial had already been held; in any case, he argued that it meant an investigation would be held at some point. If a cleric was *diffamatus*, he was accused of an offense and his superior (dean, archdeacon, or bishop) initiated an investigation; the ecclesiastical superior could order canonical purgation. Innocent III’s canon *Qualiter* (Mansi 22: 994–95, canon 8) even suggests the terms were very similar.

3. For definitions of *fama* and its function in medieval society, see Thelma Fenster and Daniel L. Smail, eds., *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003), 1–11. See also Chris Wickham, “Gossip and Resistance Among the Medieval Peasantry,” *Past and Present* 160 (1998): 3–24.

4. James A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (New York: Longman, 1995), 144–45.

5. Ibid., 147–48.

6. Paul Fournier, *Les officialités au moyen âge: Étude sur l’organisation, la compétence et la procédure des tribunaux ecclésiastiques ordinaires en France de 1180 à 1328* (Paris: Plon, 1880), 262–66; R. H. Helmholz, *Canon Law and the Law of England* (London: Hambledon, 1987), 131–35.

7. Bonnin, 581: “Ipsa die quam assignaveramus presbytero de Chartio, ad purgandum se manu septima sacerdotum, super vitio incontinenzie de quo fuerat et erat graviter diffamatus, precipue de Germana de Asneriis, comparuit coram nobis; verum, quia secum adduxerat quosdam sacerdotes minus ydoneos, ut pote tales qui de conversatione eius et vita non

potuerant plenam noticiam habuisse, eidem diem crastinum assumptionis assignavimus ad purgandum se legitime super premissis, ut dictum est, per sex presbyteros notos, et bone fame et vicinos.”

8. Ibid., 210: “Assignavimus preempter domino Hamaurrico, presbytero de Curia Dominica . . . ad prestandum purgacionem, cum duodecima manu sui ordinis, super quibusdam criminibus super quibus ipsum per inquisitionem legitimam repperimus diffamatum”; and ibid., 216: “Quia vos reverende pater, archiepiscopo Rothomagensis, michi Amaurico, presbytero de Curia Dominica, nulla monicione canonica premissa, purgacionem cum duodecim presbyteris indixistis, me ex hoc per iuris iniuriam gravavistis, propter quod a vobis in scriptis sedem apostolicam appello.”

9. The letters of defamations are collected in Bonnin, 649–74, but are also found in some entries for visitation. They are not included in RER, except as part of a daily entry.

10. Bonnin, 651, letter from John, prior of Saint-Lô; 655, William, abbot at Saint-Victor-en-Caux; 657, prior at Mont Louvete.

11. Ibid., 138.

12. Ibid., 137–38: “Galterus, presbyter de Guillarvilla, propter incontineniam, ad penam X librarum, cum uxore Henrici Tabare, parrochiani sui . . . item, presbyter de Gomer villa, infamatus de filia decani de Gomervilla, obligavit se nobis per litteras suas ad penam XX librarum.”

13. Ibid., 614: “Idem, assignavimus diem predictam Stephano, presbytero de Dunes-tanvilla, ad solvendam penam viginti librarum turonensium, quam eidem inflexeramus alias, quamque promiserat se soluturum, pro eo quod fuerat et erat diffamatus de filia Roberti Pesant de Longuevilla, vel ad purgandum se super huiusmodi infamia manu septima sacerdotum.”

14. Ibid., 651: “Ego, Petrus, quondam presbyter de Hardiviller . . . de consilio venerabilis patris archiepiscopi Rothomagensis, de dicta ecclesia mea ad ecclesiam de Bionvilla transtulisset.”

15. Ibid., 473: “comparuit coram nobis presbyter de Lyntot . . . eidem concessimus quod dictam ecclesiam suam infra pascha posset cum alia alicubi permutare, et iniunximus ei quod permutationem huiusmodi procuraret, alioquin ipsam in antea pro resignata haberet.” See also 492, 660.

16. Ibid., 614: “Assignavimus Galtero, presbytero de Buievilla, diem proximam ante ordines ad purgandum se manu septima sacerdotum super incontinentie vicio de quo fuerat et erat graviter diffamatus a tempore quo venit de Roma.”

17. Ibid., 29: “Item, presbyter de Gonnetot infamatus est de duabus, et fuit ad papam propter hoc, et postquam venit, dicitur recidivavisse; item, de quadam de Waletot.”

18. I am grateful to Richard Kay for bringing this reference to my attention. It is discussed in his *Council of Bourges, 1225: A Documentary History* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 556–57. Archbishop Thibaud d’Amiens excommunicated priests who kept concubines, but he discovered that they were still administering the sacraments and performing their duties as usual. Leopold Delisle, “Le clergé normand au XIII^e siècle,” *Bibliothèque de l’École de Chartes* 2nd ser. 3 (1846): 482, argued that canonical censure had lost its effectiveness because many excommunicated priests were still performing the sacraments. Yet cases from the twelfth century, discussed in Chapter 2, also indicate priests performing duties while under suspension.

19. Mansi 22: 821 (Paris, 1212), 901 (Rouen, 1214). The Council of Paris (1212): “Districte quoque prohibemus, ne quis sit quaestuarium vel conductitium praedicator: nec talibus

officium praedicationis committantur, nec ad praedicandum admittantur, sive reliquias portent, sive sine his accedent; nisi ex iusta causa, et cum litteris sui dioecisani. Nec praedicatio alicuius provinciae eis, vel quibusdam aliis, committatur ad firmam. Transgressoribus huius constitutionis poena supradicte simili percullendis." The Council of Rouen (1214): "Districte quoque inhibemus, ne quis sit conductitius vel quaestuaris praedicator, nec talibus officium praedicationis committatur, nec ad praedicandum tales admittantur, sive reliquias portent, sive sine eis accedent, nisi ex iusta causa, et cum litteris sui dioecisani. Nec praedicatio alicuius provinciae vel parochiae ei vel alii tanquam ad firmam concedatur. Transgressoribus huius constitutionis poena simili supradicte percullendis." See also Lester Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1978), 31.

20. In thirteenth-century England, statutes that survive still use the term "marriage" to describe these clerical relationships; in thirteenth-century Normandy, they were never described as marriage. See Lang and Gibbs, *Bishops and Reform*, 126.

21. See Cossar, "Clerical 'Concubines'"; Kelleher, "Like Man and Wife"; and Karras, *Unmarriages*, passim, for how relationships functioned as marriages even without the legitimation of the Church.

22. Bonnin, 32: "Item, presbyter de Vico Sancti Petri correctus fuit, per archidiaconum, de quadam vetula quam diu tenuerat, et de filio suo qui secum erat . . . et de filia sua quam habebat secum."

23. Ibid., 19: "Item, presbyter de Basinville infamatus de quadam, licet correctus ab archidiacono, perseverat, ducens eam ad forum."

24. Ibid., 21: "Item, presbyter de Fulcardi Monte, notatus de incontinenia de quadam vetula, et correctus ab archidiacono, passus fuit, ut dicitur, recidivum."

25. Ibid., 283: "Ipsa die, comparens coram nobis Girardus, presbyter de Martaigny, confessus fuit se quamdam mulierem, parochianam suam, Mathildim nomine, per triennium tenuisse."

26. Ibid., 189: "Ipsa die, Stephanus, presbyter de Comigni, qui abiuraverat quandam concubinam suam, de qua pueros habuerat, et promiserat bona fide . . . , archidiacono loci, quod, si recidivaret cum ipsa, haberet ecclesiam suam pro resignata, et postea recidivaret, prout omnia coram nobis recognovit . . . monitus fuit a nobis ut ecclesiam suam resignaret. Qui petiit diem ad deliberandum super premissis, et nos concessimus ei ut ad synodum Rothomagensis veniret deliberatus, et interim suspendimus eum." No copy of Stephen's letter is found in the register.

27. Ibid., 213: "In negotio quod movemus, ex officio nostro, contra Stephanum, presbyterum ecclesie de Comegniaco, super privacione ipsius ab ecclesia predicta, dictum S., confessum in iure, diu est, coram nobis quod promiserat bona fide viro venerabili et discreto magistro Stephano, archidiacono Wlccassini Francie, quod si recidivaret cum quadam concubina sua, de qua pueros habuerat et eandem abiuraverat, suam ecclesiam predictam haberet pro resignata, et se post dictam promissionem recidivasse cum eadem, monuimus pluries et legitime de servando premissam promissionem. Quem sic monitus et hoc facere contra iusticiam recusantem, citatum peremptor ad audiendum ius in premissis negotio, coram nobis Rothomagi, vel ibi prope, ad diem lune post dominicam qua cantatur: Jubilate, absentem, per contumaciam, dicta die, communicato bonorum virorum consilio, cognitis cause meritis, iuris ordine in omnibus observato, per sententiam diffinitivam privamus ecclesia memorata."

28. Ibid., 29: "Item, presbyter de Braichiaco, de quadam, et quia ipsa abiuravit domum ipsius presbyteri, ipse vadit comestum cum ea, et deferri facit, ad domum ipsius, cibaria sua et bladum."

29. Ibid., 39–40: “Invenimus quod presbyter de Cordomange aliquando celebravit suspensus, et tenuit concubinam; equitat in tabardo et nimis discurrit.”

30. Ibid., 45, 652: “Presbyter de Giverniaco infamatus est de quadam de Rothomago, sed mortua est, et diu fuit excommunicatus.” His letter is on 652.

31. Ibid., 13: “Item, Guillelmus, presbyter Beate Marie, notatus est de incontinenia, de quadam quam tenuit per viginti annos, ut dicitur; ipsum suspendimus quousque se purgaverit cum septima manu.”

32. Ibid., 26: “Item, presbyter de Waudenroy . . . nunquam continuit, et ter vel quater correctus, recidivavit.” The assumption is that the priest had been sexually incontinent.

33. Ibid., 330: “Item, Gaufridus, presbyter Vallis Regis, est incontinens, et precepimus decano quod inquireret super eo, maxime super quadam muliere de Gamachiis.”

34. Ibid., 27: “Invenimus quod Regnaudus, presbyter de Freanvilla, diffamatus est graviter de quadam que manet apud Pomereval.”

35. Ibid.: “Item, presbyter de Sauchio in Bosco celebrat suspensus et est infamatus de incontinenia; item, presbyter de Sauchio in Bosco infamatus de quadam de Berengervilla et de alia de Coqueraumont.”

36. Ibid., 328, 661: “invenimus quod presbyter de Wanchy erat infamatus de quadam muliere vidua de Rothomago, et habuit puerum.” Geoffroi’s letter of defamation, on 661, states that he was seriously defamed of a “quadam muliere coniugata.” I calculated the mileage between towns based on a modern map of France.

37. Polyptychum Rotomagensis ecclesiae, in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. 23, ed. Martin Bouquet et al. (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1874), 323–24; hereafter noted as Polyptychum.

38. Helmholz, 136–37, provides a discussion of the scholars who have commented on canonical purgation in this fashion.

39. Bonnin, 414: “Ipsa die, assignavimus Galtero, presbytero de Harouvilla, diem crastinam adventus Domini, ad purgandum se manu septima sacerdotum, de incontinenia de qua multipliciter erat diffamatus, prout hoc a fidedignis habebamus. Huiusmodi diffamationi non inficiabatur.”

40. Ibid., 417: “Constitutus coram nobis Galterus, presbyter de Aronvilla, cui assignata erat dicta dies ad purgandum se manu septima sacerdotum, super vicio incontinentie de qua in presentia nostra confessus fuerat alias, et confitebatur se esse diffamatum, proposuitque ipse compurgatores suos, propter dies sacros qui tunc erant, non potuerat secum commode adducere. Nos vero, ad convincendam eius malitiam, assignavimus ipsi diem crastinam instantis septuagesime Rothomagi, coram nobis, vel coram officiali nostro, si contingeret nos abesse, ad purgandum se super dicto vicio eo modo quo dictum est. Item, ibidem adhuc confessus fuit, sicut prius, se diffamatum esse.”

41. Ibid., 422: “Qua die, privavimus Galterum, quondam presbyterum ecclesie de Aronvilla, ecclesia predicta, verba que secuntur proferentes: In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, amen. Cum Galterus, presbyter rector ecclesie de Aronvilla, in ipsa parrochia et alibi super vicio incontinenie esset graviter diffamatus, nosque purgationem eidem manu septima indixerimus, certa die super hoc assignata, et ex habundati usque ad diem sabbati ante ramos palmarum prorogata seu assignata, quia dicta die prefatus G. in purgatione huiusmodi omnino defecit, nos, communicato bonorum virorum consilio, dictum G. prefata ecclesia de Aronvilla privavimus.”

42. Ibid., 424: “In primis, quia cum predictus rector coram vobis et officiali vestro vocatus, non haberet qui causam suam defenderet, nec aliquem advocatum haberet seu habere

posset qui sua desideria explicaret, ac pro ipso iura sua, defensiones et exceptions sibi competentes proponeret, et cum instantia ab officiali vestro pluries peteret ut ex officio suo sibi advocatum daret, idem officialis ipsum sibi dare denegavit et recusavit penitus et expresse. Item, cum peteret articulos super quibus intendebatis contra ipsum ad inquisitionem procedere, ipsorum copiam habere non potuit, immo fuit ei omnino denegata.”

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid.: “Item, cum in villa et parrochia in quibus moratur et conversatus est a viginti annis citra non sit aliquatenus diffamatus, iuxta libitum ad inquirendum contra eum in locis peregrines et extraneis processistis. Item, cum nullus ipsum presbyterum de aliquo crimine accusaret seu deferret, et paratus esset se defendere si quis eum accusaret, et ad ea que sibi obicerentur respondere, nullus extitit sive comparuit qui eundem deferret de aliquo crimine, seu etiam accusaret, immo, sine accusatore aliquo seu etiam delatore contra eum inquirendo graviter processistis. Item, cum diceretur forte diffamatus et falso de quadam muliere, quia adamabat eandem et se paratum coram vobis offerret ipsam abiurare omnino, et eam vellet penitus abiurare, ipsum super hoc contra iusticiam noluistis audire.”

46. Ibid., 424–25: “Item, cum offerret se coram vobis quod si constaret de cetero de diffamatione predicta de dicta muliere vel de alia, licet etiam non constaret de ea, quod volebat habere ecclesiam suam pro resignata, ipsum super hoc admittere noluistis. . . . Item, cum distet a Rothomago per viginti leucas et amplius, nec posset presbyteros de partibus suis in remotis agentes ducere apud Rothomagum, propter magnos sumptus et alias causas necessarias et probabiles ad se purgandum, si esset de iure de diffamatione, et hoc coram vobis pluries allegaret, ipsum ullatenus audire voluistis, immo, compellebatis ipsum ducere apud Rothomagum, quod erat ei impossibile . . . item, preter ordinem iuris sibi mandastis, ut cum septem presbyteris se de dicta diffamatione purgaret, cum quinque suffecissent, immo etiam pauciores.”

47. Ibid., 425; translation from RER, 484.

48. RER, 483.

49. Bonnin, 29: “Invenimus quod presbyter de Ruivilla infamatus erat de uxore cuiusdam latonii, et de ea dicebatur habere puerum.”

50. Ibid., 33–34: “Ibidem, invenimus quod Egidijs, capellanus de Ivriaco, infamatus est de incontinenia, de uxore Garnerii carpentarii.”

51. Ibid., 29: “Item, presbyter de Wanestavilla, de quadam parrochiana sua, cuius vir propter hoc ivit ultra mare, et tenuit eam per octo annos, et est pregnans.”

52. Ibid.: “Item, Laurencius, presbyter de Longo Oculo, tenet uxorem cuiusdam qui est extra terram et vocatur Beatrix Valeran, et habuit de ea puerum.”

53. Ibid., 328–29: “Item, presbyter Sancti Laurentii Parvi de incontinentia erat infamatus . . . item, presbytero Sancti Laurentii Parvi, [iniunximus] quod haberet cappam clausam, et quod se a quadam muliere coniugata, quam cognoverat antequam esset sacerdos, custodiret.”

54. Ibid., 136: “Henricus, presbyter de Estrutevilla, infamatus est de uxore Roberti de Bosco, et nuper, dominica in ramis palmarum, invenit eum dictus Robertus in porprisio suo de nocte, et se verberaverunt ad invicem.” His letter of defamation is in the entry, *ibid.*, 137.

55. Ibid., 137: “Omnibus hec visuris, Henricus, presbyter de Estrutevilla, salutem in Domino. Noverit universitas vestra, quod cum venerabilis pater O., Dei gracia, Rothomagensis archiepiscopus, archidiaconatum Maioris Caleti visitando, me de uxore Roberti de Bosco, parrochiani mei, invenisset graviter diffamatum, ego eidem me spontaneous obligavi

quod si de cetero de vicio incontinentie essem diffamatus, et non possem super hoc canonice me purgare, ego ex tunc, ipso facto, ecclesiam meam haberem pro resignata. In cuius rei testimonium presentes litteras sigillo meo et sigillo decani de Fovilla sigillavi.”

56. Cullum, “Life-Cycle and Life-Course in a Clerical and Celibate Milieu”; also “Boy/Man into Clerk/Priest: The Making of the Late Medieval Clergy,” in *Rites of Passage: Cultures of Transition in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Nicola MacDonald and W. M. Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), 51–65.

57. Unfortunately, since the ordination lists appended in Odo’s register do not date until 1255, it is impossible to know what particular rank Roger had already entered by the date of his citation; it is clear, however, he was still in minor orders. Odo’s command for the cleric to enter the major orders indicates that Roger was at least eighteen, and more likely older.

58. Bonnin, 160.

59. Ibid., 653–54: “Noveritis quod magister Rogerus de Sorhein, rector ecclesie de Limesiaco . . . recognovit se iurasse alias, quando fuit in dicta ecclesia institutus, quod ipse de ordine in ordinem se faceret promoveri, nisi esset canonice impeditus . . . iurans iterum quod de cetero ad ordines se representabit successive et se faciet promoveri, nisi fuerit canonice impeditus, volens et concedens quod nisi prout dictum est se faceret promoveri, et tunc ipso facto, sine strepitu iudicii, privetur ecclesia memorata, et privatus pronuncietur absque aliqua monitione facienda.”

60. Clerics could hold a church benefice as a rector or parson without being ordained to major orders, but they could not administer the sacraments. In these cases, they had either a vicar administer the sacrament or a co-rector who was ordained. The church at Limésy had two priests: Ralph and Roger of Sorenc. Roger has been selected and presented by Lord William of Frontebosc and Ralph of Limésy, a squire, to the archbishop for institution to the benefice. The other priest, Ralph, had been presented by the abbot of Saint Georges. Roger’s relationship to Lord William and the squire Ralph is unknown, but it is likely Roger of Sorenc was from the nobility himself. See Polyptychum, 254.

61. Bonnin, 663: “Noveritis quod cum essem apud bonos et graves, nec non apud reverendum patrem O., Dei gratia, Rothomagensis archiepiscopum, super incontinentie vicio, presertim de Mathildi dicta Grandi, coniugata, graviter diffamatus.”

62. Ibid., 385. The “tenth hand of priests” (*purgationem manu decima sacerdotum*) meant that a priest had to bring ten men of equal social stature to swear by his character. While there was no set number of compurgators required by canon law, Odo’s decision to require ten “hands” meant that this was a serious charge.

63. Ibid., 663–64.

64. Polyptychum, 254.

65. Bonnin, 614, 672–73.

66. Ibid., 426: “Item, quia dictus Lucas erat de Johanna, uxore Johannis Perier, parrochiana sua, graviter diffamatus, iniunximus ei quod ecclesiam suam permutaret cum alia extra civitatem Rothomagensem.”

67. Ibid., 532: “Cum Oliverus, presbyter, rector ecclesie de Toquevilla Rothomagensis dyocesis, fide media promiserit, ob causam adulterii quod dicebatur cum Avicia, parrochiana sua, commisisse, in manu venerabilis viri P . . . quod resignaret ecclesiam suam predictam infra festum Beati Remigii novissime preteritum, nisi eandem ecclesiam alicubi cum alia interim permutaret: quorum neutrum effectui mancavit, a nobis etiam pluries requisitus, suam predictam ecclesiam noluit resignare . . . dicta ecclesia sua per diffinitivam sententiam privamus.”

68. Ibid., 516: “Item, presbyter de Bosco Roberti diffamatus erat de uxore cuiusdam

clerici nominee Bigre, et de quadam Anglica; iniunximus ei quod dictum Bigre omnino expelleret cum uxore."

69. Ibid., 325–26: "Eadem die, cum Florentius, presbyter, rector ecclesie de Limez, coram nobis constitutus, confessus esset spontaneus se cum parrochiana propria crimen adulterii perpetrasset, iniunximus eidem quod infra octabas instantis epiphanie Domini, limina Beatorum Petri et Pauli visitaret et Romam adiret, nobisque a penitentiario domini pape litteras reportaret de itinere sic peracto, et interim in ecclesia sua faceret deserviri."

70. Ibid., 385, 425. Thomas's parish drew an annual income of thirty *livres*. See Polyp-tychum, 291.

71. Bonnin, 432: "Ipsa dies erat assignata Thome Honfroy de Wylemervilla, clerico, ad purgandum se legitime super eo quod dicebatur recidivasse cum uxore consanguinei sui, quam ad penam viginti librarum turonensium abiuraverat coram nobis. Archidiaconus vero Petrus de Ons, quem ibi loco nostri dimisimus, timens ne dictus Thomas, coram eo compars cum compurgatoribus suis, deleraret, parcere ei nolens in hac parte, iniunxit ei ut se a patria per biennium absenteret, et studio vacaret Parisiis vel alibi longe."

72. Ibid., 520, 523.

73. Jacques Rossiaud, *Medieval Prostitution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 41–42; Ruth M. Karras, *Common Women: Prostitution and Sexuality in Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 89.

74. Bonnin, 45.

75. Ibid., 379: "item, recognovit se ruppisse supertunicale cuiusdam mulieris fatue . . . item, recognovit se choreas duxisse in nuptiis cuiusdam mulieris meretricis quam maritaverat, et quam cognoverat cum aliis presbyteris vicinis, de nocte."

76. Barbara Hanawalt sees women as having an integral role inside the tavern; yet, I would argue, this is still a masculine social space because women associated with taverns suffered from suspect reputations. See Hanawalt, "The Host, the Law, and the Ambiguous Space of the Medieval London Taverns," in *Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 104–23.

77. Hannah Skoda, *Medieval Violence: Physical Brutality in Northern France 1270–1330* (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 89–91, provides a discussion of how tavern time was different from real time and could provide a sense of disconnect from the outside world.

78. Ruth Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 96–97; see also B. Ann Tlusty, *Bacchus and Civic Order: The Culture of Drink in Early Modern Germany* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2001).

79. Lateran IV (1215), canon 15, in Tanner, 242: "quo in quibusdam partibus ad potus aequales suo modo se obligant potatores, et ille iudicio talium plus laudatur, qui plures inebriat et calices faecundiores exhaurit."

80. Lateran IV specifically prohibited clerics from dicing, and ordered clerics not to be present at such games. See Lateran IV (1215), in Tanner, 243: "ad aleas vel taxillos non ludant, nec huiusmodi ludis intersint."

81. J-M Mehl, *Les jeux au royaume de France, du XIII^e au début du XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 1990), 287–308.

82. See Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 88–89, on dicing, and chapter 7 on clergy involvement with magical practices. Dice playing was known by many phrases in Latin: *alea*, *taxilus*, *talus*, and *tessera*. See Mehl, *Les jeux au royaume*, 76–78.

83. Bonnin, 116: "Item, invenimus quod Ferricus, thesaurarius, infamatus est de quadam, que vocatur Aaliz de Warenne. Item, incedit per villam, et equitat in habitu inhonesto, et in cufa, capucio extracto."

84. Ibid., 652.

85. Ibid., 116: "Magister Galterus ludit cum talis, et frequentat tabernas, et notatur de incontinenia gravi."

86. Ibid., 145: "Dominus Galterus adhuc ludit ad talos. Thesaurarius non residet, nec deservit. . . . Dominus Ferricus et dominus Galterus frequentant tabernas. Precepimus ne quis percipiat distribuciones, nisi qui deservierit."

87. Ibid., 209: "Dominus Gualterus frequentat tabernas. Dicitur quod thesaurarius recidivavit, cum illa quam adiuvavit, post abiuracionem. Iniunximus dicto Gualtero quod tabernas prorsus amodo evitaret, et monuimus."

88. Ibid., 285: "Thesaurarius Ferricus non residet, et tamen tenetur ad residenciam . . . Galterus, dictus Grossus, non residet. Dicemus ballivo quod ipse sasiat redditus eorum."

89. In other cases, the issue was excessive drinking and drunkenness. The archbishop tried a different tactic with the priest at Virville, who was a known drunk. He told the priest from Parc d'Anxtot to collect a fee from the drunken priest every time he entered a tavern within one league of the town or got drunk. Other methods of discipline for drunken priests involved an oath. Master William, the priest from Cailleville, was convicted of drunkenness and swore that, if he were accused of it in the future, he would resign his parish. See Bonnin, 10 and 136–37.

90. Ibid., 20; "Item, presbyter de Cotigines, lusor ad decios et rodellam . . . frequentat tabernas et infamatus est de incontinenia, et, licet correctus fuerit, perseverat." Of many in the deanery, including this priest, Odo noted that "Istos, vocavimus, ad diem alteram, coram nobis, et ordinabimus." O'Sullivan's translation suggests that "ordinabimus" means disciplinary action, rather than ordination. "Rodellam" is translated as quoits.

91. Ibid., 29: "item, ludit ad talos et nimium potat."

92. Ibid., 21: "aliquando amittit vestes suas in tabernis."

93. See, for instance, P. Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *L'archevêque Eudes Rigaud et la vie de l'église au XIIIe siècle* (Paris: Sirey, 1938), chap. 11.

94. Bonnin, 29–30: "Invenimus quod Adam, persona de Ivecrique, non residet in ecclesia; diffamatus erat de uxore Richardi Rufi, et de alia que manet apud Vanloyche, que peperit de ipso."

95. Ibid., 660.

96. Ibid., 385: "item, quod non erant octo dies elapsi, quod biberat in taberna et comederat cum Roberto Gondree, Johanne Huese et cum quodam alio; item, quod ab adventu citra baptizavit pueros, in ipso adventu audivit confessiones mulierum in partu laborantium, et quod a festo Sancti Michaelis citra, non ministravit eucaristiam, nisi dictis mulieribus, propter necessitatem sicut dicit."

97. Ibid., 434; Polyptychum, 296.

98. Bonnin, 330: "Item, presbyter de Gilmervilla infamatus erat de multiplici inhonestate, et inquiri precepimus per decanum, utrum dictus presbyter sit ebriosus, et utrum frequentet tabernas, et utrum male inhonesteque se gerat per villas vicinas, item, utrum sit scandalum de premissis."

99. Ibid., 669: "Omnibus hec visuris, Guillelmus, presbyter Guilemervilla . . . diffamatus, super eo videlicet quod ego potare consueveram in taberna ac me spoliare ibidem vestimentis meis et ludere ad taxillos, impignorareque libros ecclesie mee, cuiusmodi infamiam in dicti

patris presentia recognovi." Information on his church income can be found in the Polyptychum, 267.

100. Tlusty, *Bacchus and Civic Disorder*, 132–33, discusses brawling and reputation inside taverns.

101. See Matthew Bennett, "Military Masculinity in England and Northern France, c. 1050–1225," in Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 73–88; P. J. P. Goldberg, "Masters and Men in Later Medieval England," in *ibid.*, 56–70; and John Marshall Carter, *Medieval Games: Sports and Recreation in Feudal Society* (New York: Greenwood, 1992), chap. 4. The church's opposition to tournaments was first stated in canon 14 of Lateran II (1139); see Tanner, 200. This canon acknowledged the connection between masculine prowess and jousting and ordered that any man who dies while engaged in such deplorable activities be denied a Christian burial. This canon is repeated at Lateran IV (canon 18).

102. See Richard Kaeuper's discussion of knights who adapted religion to their practice of violence in *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 47.

103. Nicholas Fisher, "Violence, Masculinity and the Law in Athens," in *When Men Were Men*, ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon (New York: Routledge, 1998), 75–76.

104. Bonnin, 19: "Invenimus quod presbyter de Nigella diffamatus de quadam que dicitur pregnans de ipso, et de negociacione, et viliter tractans patrem suum qui patronus est ecclesie quam possidet, et persona pugnavit cum quodam milite, gladio evaginato, cum clamore et sequela parentele et amicorum suorum."

105. *Ibid.*, 19–20. The phrase "in habitu inhonesto" is used to describe the clothing of the priest. Bonnin defines this as clothing that is prohibited for clergy by canon law, especially by color or type. See *ibid.*, 28.

106. *Ibid.*, 28: "Item, presbyter de Baudribosco defert habitum inhonestum et gerit se tanquam armiger, et solet ministrare lanceas ad bohordamenta, nec residet in ecclesia."

107. J-M Mehl, "Les autorités ecclésiastiques face au jeu sportif dans la France médiévale," in *Sports und Kultur/Sports et civilisations*, ed. L. Burgener and M. Villett (Berne: Publications Universitaires Européennes, 1984), 74, 187. Mehl's study states that almost 88 percent of all men who played *soule* were between fifteen and twenty-four.

108. Bonnin, 10, 649: "Item, . . . presbyter Sancti Vedasti de Depedale, convictus et confessus quod publice ludebat ad pilam, et quod in ludo suo quidam fuerat vulneratus, iuravit coram nobis quod si super hoc alias convincatur, ecclesiam suam ex tunc habebit pro resignata." It is unknown whether he was convicted of injuring a player or of publicly playing *soule*.

109. *Ibid.*, 29: "Invenimus quod presbyter de Ruivilla infamatus erat de uxore cuiusdam latonii, et de ea dicebatur habere puerum; item . . . non residet in ecclesia, ludit ad pilam, in ecclesia non residet, et equitat in tabardo." Bonnin defines the "tabardo" worn by the priest as a short cape that soldiers wore.

110. Sandy Bardsley, *Venomous Tongues: Speech and Gender in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), chap. 4.

111. Bonnin, 28: "Invenimus quod presbyter de Osmondi Villa infamatus erat de incontinentia, et deferebat inhonestum habitum et vexat parrochianos suos . . . item, presbyter de Auegart rixosus est et levis capitis, et rixatur cum parrochianis suis." RER, 32, translates "levis capitis" as "scatterbrained." Together with the quarreling, Odo seems to indicate this priest is mentally ill.

112. *Ibid.*, 472–73: "Comparuit coram nobis Guillelmus, presbyter de Magneville, citatus ab archidiacono coram nobis, pro eo quod bellicosus et percussor dicebatur, et verberabat parrochianos suos."

113. *Ibid.*, 518: “Cum intellexissemus Guillelmum, presbyterum de Magneville, diffamatum de crimine furti, de percussione multiplici, eidem infamiam huiusmodi in nostra presentia sponte confitenti, factum tamen neganti, indiximus purgationem manu septima sacerdotum vicinorum faciendam, et ad hoc faciendum assignavimus ipsi diem crastinam synodi penthecostes.”

114. *Ibid.*, 222: “Transuentes per villam de Braio, parrochiani ipsius ecclesie, in presencia nostra, accusaverunt rectorem ipsius ecclesie. Dicebantque quod ipse cum armis de nocte incedebat per villam, et quod rixosus et multum maledicus cum parrochianis suis, dicendo sibi verba contumeliosa, infamatusque erat de incontinenia.”

115. *Ibid.*: “Vocato autem ipso presbytero, apud Salicosam, coram nobis . . . monuimus dictum presbyterum super premissis, ut se de cetero a talibus abstineret, alioquin contra ipsum procederemus, prout dictaret ordo iuris.”

116. *Ibid.*, 45: “Presbyter de Vernonel infamatus est de uxore cuiusdam fabri; item, verberavit prepositum de Vernonel; contenciosus est et rixosus cum parrochianis.”

117. *Ibid.*, 283.

118. *Ibid.*, 417: “Ad quam diem citatus fuerat perempter et personaliter coram nobis Girardus, presbyter de Marteigny, responsurus super eo quod Petrum de Vivario, hominem domini Th. de Bello Monte, militis, dicebatur vulnerasse; qui quidem comparuit coram nobis ea die, nemine contra eum veniente. Nos tamen, nolentes factum huiusmodi relinquere penitus indiscussum, ab ipso quesivimus utrum leserat seu percusserat hominem memoratum, et respondit quod sic, cum ense quodam, ad tuitionem corporis sui, quia homo ille irruebat in eum, et tunc demum, de consensu eius, proposuimus, per Dei gratiam, inquiri facere super facto predicto, de modo vulnerationis, et causa et qualitate vulneris.”

119. *Ibid.*, 32, 650: “Ego, Gaufridus, presbyter de Grignosa Villa, notum facio universis presentes litteras inspecturis, quod cum vir venerabilis, archidiaconus Rothomagensis, me graviter infamatum de incontinenia invenisset, et me super hoc monuisset et correxisset, et post monitionem et correctionem huiusmodi recidivasset, ego, voluntate spontanea, promisi reverendo patri O., Dei gratia, Rothomagensi archiepiscopo, quod si me alias super hiis invenerit infamatum, si me purgare non possem, eidem redderem triginta libras turonenses pro pena.” The annual income of the parish was 60 *livres*.

120. *Ibid.*, 144, 154.

121. *Ibid.*, 144: “Eadem die, Gualterum, presbyterum de Tenvilla, culpis suis exigentibus, in scriptis suspendimus, presertim cum eundem invenerimus culpabilem in vulnerando Girardum de Tenvilla, laicum.”

122. *Ibid.*, 652: “Richardus, presbyter de Tostis, diffamatus de morte duorum mercatorum et de receptatione latronum, promisit se purgaturum coram [nobis] aut voluntatem facturum, et nos ad hoc assignavimus ei diem in crastino Beati Romani.”

123. *Ibid.*, 488: “Ricardus, presbyter de Tostis, iuravit et promisit, propositis sacrosanctis evangelii, manu ad pectus posita, quod ab octobis instantis nativitatibus Beate Marie, suam ecclesiam habebit pro resignata omnino et nichil in ipsa inantea aliquatenus reclamabit, vivamus vel moriamur, et ordinationi nostre stabit.”

124. *Ibid.*, 658–59: “Noverit universitas vestra quod cum super irregularitate comissa a me, ut dicebatur, pro eo quod suspensus et excommunicatus dicebar celebravisse divina; item, super crimine fornicacionis et adulterii quod dicebar commisisse cum Robina, uxore . . . , penildore, de Novavilla; item, super eo quod dicebar lusor ad taxillos et frequentator tabernarum; item, super eo quod dicebar capellanum capelle de Rocheroliis vulnerasse graviter cum falcone in capite, essem apud bonos et graves.” On other occasions, Odo seemingly

ignored the violent behavior. See the case of William of Salmonville, a canon at Rouen, in Bonnin, 32, 35, and 122, and in Tabbagh's *Diocèse de Rouen*, 209. Odo Rigaldus found Master William of Salmonville, a secular canon at Rouen, culpable for imprisoning servants of the church courts in his own house, and he was ordered to make amends. At the official visit of the cathedral chapter a month later, the same William of Salmonville was accused of sexual incontinence, theft, and homicide. No disciplinary action was noted in the archbishop's register. Three years later, William was accused of sexual indiscretions and *pluribus aliis*, many other things. On this occasion, Odo ordered William not to leave town in order to facilitate the investigation of his lifestyle. William of Salmonville was not mentioned again in register entries, yet, according to other sources, he continued as a canon at Rouen until 1261, ten years after his last offenses were noted.

125. The first entry notes canonical purgation with the ninth hand of priests, while the second entry records the procedure with the seventh hand of priests. Bonnin, 415: "Ipsa die, assignavimus presbytero de Civeriis, multipliciter diffamato de diversis viciis, diem ante ordines natalis, ad purgandum se manu nona sacerdotum de incontinencia, de adulterio, percussione multiplici et de frequentatione tabernarum." And later, 417: "Ipsa die, comparuit coram nobis presbyter de Civeriis, cui assignata erat dies precedens ad purgandum se manu septima sacerdotum, super vicio incontinentie et multis aliis criminibus quibus erat graviter diffamatus, et eidem assignavimus diem veneris ante natale ad id agendum."

126. *Ibid.*, 666: "Omnibus hec visuris, Johannes, rector ecclesie de Civeriis, salutem in Domino. Noveritis quod cum essem super incontinencia cum parrochiana mea et aliis mulieribus, frequentatione tabernarum, percussione . . . graviter diffamatus, videns quod idem pater posset contra me dure procedere super eo, si vellet . . . super hoc mecum misericorditer agenti, promisi et iuravi, manu ad pectus posita, propositis sacrosanctis ewangelii, quod ecclesiam meam predictam ad voluntatem dicti patris resignabo sine strepitu iudicii, simpliciter et absolute, et absque ulla reclamatione, et eam pro resignata extunc habeo, videlicet quandocunque super hoc a dicto patre fuero requisitus."

127. *Ibid.*, 423: "Item, eadem die, comparuit personaliter coram nobis Johannes, presbyter de Cyveriis, qui multipliciter fuerat et erat super vicio incontinentie, super frequentatione tabernarum, super scurrilitate, super percussione apud bonos et graves diffamatus, super quibus quidem de consensu eius inquisitionem fieri longe ante feceramus, petens a nobis sibi dicte inquisitionis copiam exhiberi. Quia vero per inspectionem dicte inquisitionis nobis constitit ipsum irretitum esse criminibus supradictis, eiusdem petitioni acquiescere nolimus in hac parte, sed ipsi purgationem indiximus manu septima sui ordinis faciendam, et ad hoc eidem assignavimus diem lune proximam post mensem pasche."

128. *Ibid.*, 497–98: "ubi tunc assignavimus presbytero de Civeriis diem crastinum subsequentis synodi, ad purgandum se manu septima sacerdotum super vicio incontinentie de quo erat multipliciter diffamatus."

129. *Ibid.*, 502: "Ipsa die, comparuit coram nobis Johannes, presbyter de Civeriis, cum septem presbyteris, paratus se purgare super multis viciis que imposita sibi fuerant, de quibus etiam erat multipliciter diffamatus. Sed nos, timentes ne ipse cum iisdem presbyteris deleraret, recolentes etiam quod dudum suas nobis tradiderat litteras super premissis, purgationem huiusmodi eidem duximus remittendam, assignantes eidem diem martis ante nativitatem Domini ad implendum quod in dictis litteris continetur, ut promisit proprio iuramento."

130. *Ibid.*, 516–17: "Johannes, presbyter, rector ecclesie de Civeriis, in camera clericorum nostrorum, recognovit quod pluries graviter diffamatus fuerat apud bonos et graves de

incontinentia, de percussione multiplici, et de aliis pro quibus dederat nobis suas litteras dudum de resignando ecclesiam suam ad voluntatem nostram; qui quidem recidivavit, propter quod ipsum fecimus coram nobis evocari, et ipse, videns quod durissime possemus procedere contra eum, petiit misericorditer agi cum ipso."

The Manly Priest

1. *Le Registre de l'officialité de l'Abbaye de Cerisy, 1314–1457*, ed. M. Dupont, *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie* 3rd ser. 10 (Caen, 1880): 217, 241–42. Hereafter *Registre de Cerisy*.

2. Andrew Finch has come close to pursuing these questions but stops short of focusing on the clergy as a group. His numbers have underestimated the number of clerics involved in such actions. See Andrew J. Finch, "Sexual Relations and Marriage in Later Medieval Normandy," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47, 2 (April 1996): 236–56; also Finch, "The Nature of Violence in the Middle Ages: An Alternative Perspective," *Historical Research* 70, 173 (October 1997): 249–68.

3. Cullum, "Clergy, Masculinity and Transgression," 189.

4. See Werner, "Promiscuous Priests and Vicarage Children," 159–81; Neal, *The Masculine Self*, 89–122; Ruth M. Karras, *Unmarriages: Women, Men, and Sexual Unions in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), chap. 3; Cossar, "Clerical 'Concubines' in Northern Italy in the Fourteenth Century"; Bornstein, "Priests and Villagers in the Diocese of Cortona"; Kelleher, "Like Man and Wife," 349–60.

5. Henry of Huntingdon wrote a section of his history sometime between 1133 and 1143 in which he criticizes the decrees on clerical marriage, which makes him the last writer to favor clerical marriage, although in a less polemical, more discreet fashion. See Henry of Huntingdon, *History*, xviii, 50, 58, 61–62. See also Nancy Partner's discussion of his method of criticism in "Henry of Huntingdon," 467–75.

6. Brooke, "Gregorian Reform in Action," 19–21.

7. Epsicopal visitation was ordered by Lateran IV (1215), canon 7; see also Gibbs and Lang, *Bishops and Reform, 1215–72*, 113–58.

8. Karras, *Unmarriages*.

9. Finch, "The Nature of Violence," 255. He gives no indication where this information came from.

10. Finch, "Sexual Relations and Marriage," 236–56.

11. Cullum, "Life-Cycle and Life-Course in a Clerical and Celibate Milieu," 271–81; R. N. Swanson, *Church and Society in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 42–43; see also Cullum's discussion of this factor with regard to clerical behavior in "Clergy, Masculinity and Transgression."

12. See Finch, "The Nature of Violence," 255.

13. Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society*, 316.

14. Lateran IV (1215), canon 14.

15. Finch, "Sexual Relations," 245n30.

16. *Registre de Cerisy*, 26, 29, 30, 33. Johannes de Mara is also known as Johannes Guesdon.

17. Parish, *Clerical Celibacy*, 179.

18. This story originally appeared in Henry of Huntingdon's chronicle but was later repeated in chronicles by Roger of Hoveden and Matthew of Paris. Parish erroneously attributes it to Matthew of Paris (*Clerical Celibacy*, 178–79).

19. See Helen Parish, “‘It Was Never Good World Sence Minister Must Have Wyves’: Clerical Celibacy, Clerical Marriage, and Anticlericalism in Reformation England,” *Journal of Religious History* 36, 1 (March 2012): 52–69.

20. Susan C. Karant-Nunn, “The Masculinity of Martin Luther: Theory, Practicality and Humor,” 172, *passim*, and Merry Wiesner-Hanks, “Lustful Luther: Male Libido in the Writings of the Reformer,” 190–212, both in *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, ed. Scott H. Hendrix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn (Kirkville, Mo.: Truman State University Press, 2008).

21. Parish, *Clerical Celibacy*, 145–49, 154–55, 163.

22. Helmut Puff, *Sodomy in Reformation Germany and Switzerland, 1400–1600* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 167.

23. See Marjorie Plummer, *From Priest’s Whore to Pastor’s Wife: Clerical Marriage and the Process of Reform in the Early German Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2012); Parish, “‘It Was Never Good.’”

24. Helen L. Parish, *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation: Precedent, Policy and Practice* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

25. Scott Hendrix, “Masculinity and Patriarchy in Reformation Germany,” in Hendrix and C. Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 71–91.

26. Raymond A. Mentzer, “Masculinity and the Reformed Tradition in France,” in Hendrix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 120–39; Karen E. Spierling, “Father, Son, and Pious Christian: Conceptions of Masculinity in Reformation Geneva,” in Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 95–119.

27. Spierling, “Father, Son, and Pious Christian,” 100–101.

28. Tlusty, *Bacchus and Civic Disorder*, 74–75.

29. Ulrike Strasser, “‘The First Form and Grace’: Ignatius of Loyola and the Reformation of Masculinity,” in Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 45–70, 54.

30. Lyndal Roper, “Was There a Crisis in Gender Relations?” in *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Religion and Sexuality in the Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 37–52.

Bibliography



Manuscripts

Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Latin 1245
MS Latin 11052

Primary Printed Sources

- Les actes de Guillaume le Conquérant et de la reine Mathilde pour les abbayes Caennaises.* Ed. Lucien Musset. Caen, 1967.
- The Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century.* Ed. Thomas Wright. Rolls Series 59. London: Longman, 1872.
- Antiquus Cartularius ecclesiae Baiocensis (Livre Noir).* Ed. Vivien Bourrienne. Rouen-Paris, 1902.
- Arnoux, Mathieu. *Des Clercs au service de la réforme: Études et documents sur les chanoines réguliers de la province de Rouen.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Arnulf of Lisieux. *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem Episcopum.* Ed. E. Dümmler et al. In MGH LdL III, 81–108.
- . *Letter Collection of Arnulf of Lisieux.* Trans. Carolyn P. Schriber. Text and Studies in Religion 72. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1997.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *The Letters of St. Bernard de Clairvaux.* Trans. Bruno Scott James. New York: AMS Press, 1953, 1998.
- . *Sancti Bernardi opera.* Ed. Jean Leclercq et al. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957–.

- Bougerol, Jacques-Guy. "Un sermon inédit d'Eudes Rigaud." *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 62 (1995): 343–58.
- Boutemy, A. "Deux poèmes inconnu de Serlon de Bayeux et une copie nouvelle de son poème contre les moines de Caen." *Moyen Âge* 41 (1938): 241–67.
- Cameracensium et Noviomensium clericorum epistolae*. In MGH Ldl, III, 574–78. Ed. H. Boehmer. Hannover, 1897.
- Cartulaire Normand de Philippe Auguste Louis VIII, Saint Louis et Philippe le Hardi*. Ed. Leopold Delisle. Geneva: Megariotis Reprints, 1978.
- The Chronicle of the Abbey of Morigny, France, c. 1100–1150*. Trans. Richard Cusimano. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 2003.
- The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*. Ed. and trans. Eleanor Searle. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Concilia Rotomagensis Provinciae*. 2 vols. Ed. Guillaume Bessin. Rouen: Francis Vaultier, 1717.
- Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*. Ed. Dorothy Whitelock. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Cum sub liberi arbitrii potestate creati simus* (Treatise on Grace). Ed. Erwin Frauenknecht. In *Die Verteidigung der Priesterehe in der Reformzeit*. Hahn-sche: Buchhandlung, 1997.
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils. Volume One: Nicea to Lateran V*. Ed. Norman P. Tanner. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990.
- Delisle, Leopold. "Visites pastorales de maître Henri de Vezelai, archidiacre d'Hiëmois, en 1267 et 1268." *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 54 (1893): 457–67.
- Denifle, Heinrich. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*. 4 vols. Paris, 1889–97.
- Documents sur les relations de la royauté avec les villes en France de 1180 à 1314*. Ed. Arthur Giry. Geneva, 1974.
- Eadmer. *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia: et opuscula duo de vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam miraculis ejus Historia Novorum*. Ed. Martin Rule. Rolls Series 81. London: Longman, 1884.
- . *History of Recent Events in England (Historia Novorum in Anglia)*. Trans. Geoffrey Bosanquet. London: Cresset Press, 1964.
- The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*. 6 vols. Ed. and trans. Marjorie Chib-nall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy (Orderic Vitalis)*. 4 vols. Trans. Thomas Forester. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

- English Episcopal Acta 16: Coventry and Lichfield, 1160–1182*. Ed. M. J. Franklin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Epistolae Herberti de Losinga, Osberti de Clara et Elmeri Prioris Cantuariensis*. Ed. Robert Anstruther. Charleston, S.C.: Nabu Press, 2012.
- Eudes of Rouen. *Register*. Trans. S. M. Brown, ed. J. F. O'Sullivan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1066–1300*. 10 vols. Ed. Diana Greenway. London: Institute of Historical Research, 1968.
- Gerald of Wales. *The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales*. Trans. H. E. Butler. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005.
- . *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Gemma Ecclesiastica*. Ed. J. S. Brewer. London: Longman, 1862.
- . *The Jewel of the Church*. Trans. John J. Hagen. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Grossus, Geoffrey. *The Life of Blessed Bernard of Tiron*. Trans. Ruth Harwood Cline. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009.
- Henry of Huntingdon. *History of the English People, 1000–1154*. Trans. Diana Greenway. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 2009.
- Herbertus de Losinga (Bishop of Norwich). *Epistolae Herberti de Losinga, Osberti de Clara et Elmeri Prioris Cantuariensis*. Ed. Robertus Anstruther. Charleston, S.C.: Nabu Press, 2012.
- Hugh the Chanter. *The History of the Church of York, 1066–1127*. Ed. and trans. Charles Johnson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- John of Forde. *The Life of Wulfric of Haselbury, Anchorite*. Trans. Pauline Matarasso. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2011.
- Kay, Richard. *The Council of Bourges, 1225: A Documentary History*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- "Letter of the Clergy of Cambrai and Noyon." Trans. John S. Ort, unpublished.
- The Letters of Anselm of Canterbury*. 3 vols. Trans. Walter Frohlich. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1990–1993.
- The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*. Ed. and trans. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga*. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. Edward Meyrick Goulburn and Henry Symonds. Oxford: James Parker, 1878.
- Liverani, F. *Spicilegium Liberianum*. Florence, 1863.
- Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI et XII conscripti*. Hannover, 1891–97. Cited as MGH LdL.

- Monumenta originalia de l'Histoire de Saint-Yves*. Ed. A. de la Borderie et al. Saint-Brieuc, 1887.
- "Norman Anonymous." *Electronic Norman Anonymous Project*. <http://norman-anonymous.org/ENAP>.
- Notes et documents concernant l'état des campagnes de la haute Normandie dans les derniers temps du moyen âge*. Ed. Charles de Beaurepaire. Evreux: Le Brument, 1865.
- Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century*. Ed. Richard Morris. London: Early English Text Society, 1873.
- Patrologiae Latina*. 217 vols. Ed. J-P Migne. Paris, 1878–91.
- Peter Damian: Letters*. 4 vols. Trans. Owen J. Blum. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Polyptychum Rotomagensis ecclesiae*. In *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* 23, ed. Martin Bouquet et al. Paris: Palmé, 1874.
- Les pouillés de la province de Rouen*. Ed. Auguste Longnon. Paris, 1903.
- The Priory of Hexham: Its Chroniclers, Endowments and Annals*. Ed. James Raine. Durham: Surtees Society, 1865.
- Pseudo-Udharici Epistola de Continentia Clericorum*. In MGH LdL, I, 244–60.
- . In *Die Verteidigung der Priesterehe in der Reformzeit*. Ed. Erwin Frauenknecht, 203–15. Hahnsche: Buchhandlung, 1997.
- Regesta Honorii Papae III*. Ed. Pietro Pressuti. 2 vols. Rome: Verlag, 1978.
- Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. Ed. P. Jaffé. Leipzig, 1885.
- Regestrum visitationum archiepiscopi Rothomagensis*. Ed. Theodosius Bonnin. Rouen: Brument, 1852.
- The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085*. Ed. H. E. J. Cowdry. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Le Registre de l'officialité de l'Abbaye de Cerisy, 1314–1457*. Ed. M. Dupont. In *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie* 3rd ser. 10. Caen, 1880.
- Registres de Alexander IV*. Ed. C. Bourel de la Roncière et al. 3 vols. Paris: Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1895–1959.
- Les Registres de Gregoire IX: Recueil des bulles de ce pape*. Vol. 1. Ed. Lucien Auvray. Paris: Libraire de Thorin et fils, 1896.
- Roger of Howden. *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*. Vol. 1. Ed. William Stubbs. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1868.
- Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. 53 vols. Ed. J. D. Mansi. Paris and Leipzig, 1901–27.

- Serlo of Bayeux. *Defensio pro filiis presbyterorum*. In MGH LdL III, 580–83.
- Les statuts synodaux français du XIIIe siècle précédés de l'histoire du synode diocésain depuis ses origines*. 3 vols. Ed. Odette Pontal. Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1971–88.
- . Vol. 1. *Les statuts de Paris et le synodal de l'ouest*.
- . Vol. 2. *Les statuts de 1230 à 1260*.
- . Vol. 3. *Les statuts synodaux angevins*.
- Die Texte des Normannischen Anonymus*. Ed. Karl Pellens. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1966.
- Theobaldi Stampensis Epistola Ad Roscelinum*. In MGH LdL III, 603–7.
- Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*. Ed. Giles Constable, trans. Bernard S. Smith. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Tractatus pro clericorum conubio*. Ed. Erwin Frauenknecht. In *Die Verteidigung der Priesterehe in der Reformzeit*. Hahnsche: Buchhandlung, 1997.
- Tractatus Eboracenses*. In MGH LdL II, II, 643–55.
- “Trois sermons synodaux de la collection attribuée à Jean de la Rochelle.” Ed. Louis Duval-Arnould. *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 69, 3–4 (1976): 336–400; 70, 1–2 (1977): 35–71.
- Vie du Bienheureux Thomas Hélie de Biville*. Ed. L. Delisle. Cherbourg: Bedelefontaine and Syffert, 1860.
- Vita Herluini of Gilbert Crispin*. Ed. Sally Vaughn. In *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State, 1034–1136*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981.
- William of Malmesbury. *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum (The History of the English Bishops)*. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom. Oxford: Clarendon, 2007.
- . *Gesta Regum Anglorum (Deeds of the English Kings)*. 2 vols.. Ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . *Historia Novella (The Contemporary History)*. Ed. and trans. K. R. Potter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . *Saints' Lives: Lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*. Trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Thomson. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- William of Newburgh. *The History of English Affairs, Book I (Historia Rerum Anglicarum)*. Trans. and ed. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy. Wiltshire: Aris and Phillips, 1988.

Secondary Sources

- Adam, Paul. *La vie paroissiale en France au XIV^e siècle*. Paris: Sirey, 1964.
- Alexandre-Bidon, Daniele and Didier Lett. *Children in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.
- Andrieu-Guitrancourt, Pierre. *L'archevêque Eudes Rigaud et la vie de l'église au XIII^e siècle*. Paris: Sirey, 1938.
- An Ghaill, Mairtin Mac. *Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Arenas*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996.
- Arnold, John H. "The Labour of Continence: Masculinity and Clerical Virginity." In *Medieval Virginites*, ed. Anke Bernau, Sarah Salih, and Ruth Evans, 102–18. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003.
- Arnoux, Mathieu. *Des clercs au service de la réforme: Études et documents sur la chanoines réguliers de la province de Rouen*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Aubrun, M. *La paroisse en France des origines au XV^e siècle*. Paris: Picard, 1986.
- Avril, Joseph. "Archevêchés, diocèses et paroisses aux XII^e-XIV^e siècles: à propos de quelques travaux récents." *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* 82 (1996): 323–45.
- Baldwin, John W. "A Campaign to Reduce Clerical Celibacy at the Turn of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries." In *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel Le Bras*, vol. 2, 1041–53. Paris: Sirey, 1965.
- . *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*. 2 vols. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- . "Philip Augustus and the Norman Church." *French Historical Studies* 6, 1 (1969): 1–30.
- Barber, Richard W. *Tournaments: Jousts, Chivalry and Pageants in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989.
- Bardsley, Sandy. *Venomous Tongues: Speech and Gender in Late Medieval England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Barlow, Frank. *The English Church, 1066–1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church*. New York: Longman, 1979.
- Barrow-Smith, Julia. "Hereford Bishops and Married Clergy, c. 1130–1240." *Historical Research* 60 (1987): 1–8.
- Barstow, Anne. *Married Priests and the Reforming Papacy: The Eleventh-Century Debates*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1982.
- Bates, David. "The Character and Career of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux (1049/50–1097)." *Speculum* 50, 1 (1975): 1–20.

- Baudot, Marcel. "Observatoire sur le patronage des églises en Normandie." In *Recueil d'études normandes en hommage au docteur Jean Fournée: Cahier Léopold Delisle, no. exceptionnel* 1978, 43–49. Nogent-sur-Marne: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Normandes, 1979.
- Beaudette, Paul. "'In the World But Not of It': Clerical Celibacy as a Symbol of the Medieval Church." In Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety*, 23–46.
- Bennett, Judith. "Feminism and History." *Gender and History* 1 (1989): 251–72.
- Bennett, M. "Military Masculinity in England and Northern France, c. 1050–1225." In Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 71–88.
- Besse, Jean-Marial. *Abbayes et prieurés de l'ancienne France. Vol. 7, Province ecclésiastique de Rouen*. Liguge et Paris, 1914.
- Bloch, Marc. *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*. Paris: Belles-Lettres, 1931.
- Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. "Pope Gregory VII and the Prohibition of Nicolaitism." In Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety*, 239–67.
- Bonnassie, Pierre. *Le clergé rural dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne*. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 1995.
- Bornstein, Daniel. "Priests and Villagers in the Diocese of Cortona." *Ricerche Storiche* 27 (1997): 93–106.
- Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Boyle, Leonard. *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200–1400*. London: Variorum, 1981.
- Brooke, C. N. L. "The Composition of the Chapter of St. Paul's, 1086–1163." *Cambridge Historical Journal* 10, 2 (1951): 111–32.
- . "Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050–1200." *Cambridge Historical Journal* 12, 1 (1956): 1–21.
- . "Married Men Among the English Higher Clergy, 1066–1200." *Cambridge Historical Journal* 12, 2 (1956): 187–88.
- . *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Brown, Peter L. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Brundage, James A. *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- . *Medieval Canon Law*. New York: Longman, 1995.

- Bugge, John. *Virginitas: An Essay in the History of a Medieval Ideal*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1975.
- Bullough, Vern. "On Being a Male in the Middle Ages." In Lees, ed., *Medieval Masculinities*, 31–45.
- . "Postscript: Heresy, Witchcraft and Sexuality." In Bullough and Brundage, *Sexual Practices and the Medieval Church*, 206–11.
- Bullough, Vern and James A. Brundage, eds. *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*. New York: Garland, 1996.
- , eds. *Sexual Practices and the Medieval Church*. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus, 1982.
- Bullough, Vern and Bonnie Bullough. *Cross-Dressing, Sex, and Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing." In *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, 110–69. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Cadden, Joan. *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Carter, John Marshall. *Medieval Games: Sports and Recreation in Feudal Society*. New York: Greenwood, 1992.
- Chalin, Nadine-Josette, ed. *Le diocèse de Rouen-Le Havre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1976.
- Cheney, Christopher. *Episcopal Visitation of Monasteries in the Thirteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1931.
- Cheyette, Fredric L., ed. *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, 1968.
- Chibnall, Marjorie. *The World of Orderic Vitalis*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- Clover, C. "Regardless of Sex: Men, Women, and Power in Early Northern Europe." *Speculum* 68 (1993): 363–87.
- Cochini, Christian. *The Apostolic Origins of Priestly Celibacy*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990.
- Congar, Yves. "Modèle monastique et modèle sacerdotal en Occident de Grégoire VII à Innocent III." In *Études de civilisation médiévale (IXe–XIIe siècles): Mélanges offerts à Edmond-René Labande*. Poitiers: CESC, 1974, 153–60.

- Connell, R. W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Coon, Lynda. *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval West*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Constable, Giles. *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Cornwall, Andrea and Nancy Lindisfarne. *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Cossar, Roisin. "Clerical 'Concubines' in Northern Italy in the Fourteenth Century." *Journal of Women's History* 23 (2011): 110–31.
- Cowdrey, H. E. J. *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- . *Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- . "Pope Gregory VII and the Chastity of the Clergy." In Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety*, 269–302.
- Crosby, Everett U. *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the Mensa Episcopalis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *The King's Bishops: The Politics of Patronage in England and Normandy, 1066–1216*. New York: Palgrave, 2013.
- Cullum, P. H. "Boy/Man into Clerk/Priest: The Making of the Late Medieval Clergy." In *Rites of Passage: Cultures of Transition in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Nicola MacDonald and W. M. Ormrod, 51–65. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004.
- . "Clergy, Masculinity and Transgression in Late Medieval England." In Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 178–96.
- . "Learning to Be a Man, Learning to Be a Priest in Late Medieval England." In *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*, ed. Sarah Rees-Jones, 135–53. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- . "Life-Cycle and Life-Course in a Clerical and Celibate Milieu: Northern England in the Later Middle Ages." In *Time and Eternity: The Medieval Discourse*, ed. Gerhard Jaritz and Gerson Moreno-Riano, 271–81. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Cullum, P. H. and Katherine J. Lewis, eds. *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013.
- Cummins, John. *The Hound and Hawk: The Medieval Art of Hunting*. New York: Saint Martin's, 1988.
- Cutts, Edward. *Parish Priests and Their People in the Middle Ages in England*. London, 1914.

- Darlington, Oscar G.. *The Travels of Odo Rigaud, Archbishop of Rouen*. Philadelphia, 1940.
- Davis, Adam J. *The Holy Bureaucrat: Eudes Rigaud and Religious Reform in Thirteenth-Century Normandy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- D'Avray, David. *Medieval Marriage: Symbolism and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris Before 1300*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- De Jong, Mayke. "Imitatio Morum: The Cloister and Clerical Purity in the Carolingian World." In Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety*, 49–80.
- . *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West*. New York: Brill, 1996.
- Delisle, Leopold. "Canons du concile tenu à Lisieux en 1064." *Journal des Savants* (1901): 516–21.
- . "Le clergé normand au XIII^e siècle." *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 2nd ser. 5, 3 (1846): 479–99.
- . *Études sur la condition de la classe agricole et l'état de l'agriculture en Normandie au moyen âge*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1903.
- Desborough, Donald E. "Politics and Prelacy in the Late Twelfth Century: The Career of Hugh de Nonant, Bishop of Coventry, 1188–98." *Historical Research* 64, 153 (1991): 1–14.
- Devailly, Guy. "Les patronats d'église en Normandie aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles." *Recueil d'études en hommage à Lucien Merlet, Cahier des Annales de Normandie* 23 (1990): 351–57.
- Dobiache-Rojdestvensky, Olga. *La vie paroissiale en France au XIII^e siècle après les actes épiscopaux*. Paris, 1911.
- Dortel-Claudot, Michel. "Le prêtre et le mariage: Évolution de la législation canonique des origins au XII^e siècle." *L'Année Canonique* 17 (1973): 319–44.
- Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. London: Routledge, 1970.
- DuBois, Henri. "Patronage et revenu ecclésiastique en Normandie au XIII^e siècle." In *Papauté, monachisme et théories politiques*, ed. Pierre Guichard, 461–71. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1994.
- Duby, Georges. "In Northwestern France: The Youth in Twelfth-Century Aristocratic Society." In Cheyette, ed., *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe*, 198–209.

- . *Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Elliott, Dyan. *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality and Demonology in the Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- . "Pollution, Illusion, and Masculine Disarray: Nocturnal Emissions and the Sexuality of the Clergy." In *Constructing Medieval Sexuality*, ed. James Schultz, 1–23. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Fenster, Thelma and Daniel L. Smail, eds. *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Fenton, Kirsten A. *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008.
- . "Writing Masculinity and Religious Identity in Henry of Huntingdon." In Cullum and Lewis, eds., *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, 64–76.
- Finch, Andrew J. "The Nature of Violence in the Middle Ages: An Alternative Perspective." *Historical Research* 70, 173 (October 1997): 249–68.
- . "Sexual Relations and Marriage in Later Medieval Normandy." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47, 2 (April 1996): 236–56.
- Fisher, Nicholas. "Violence, Masculinity, and the Law in Athens." In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, 68–93. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Fliche, Auguste. *La réforme grégorienne*. 3 vols. Paris, 1924–25.
- Foreville, Raymonde. "La réception des conciles généraux dans l'église et la province de Rouen au XIII^e siècle." In *Gouvernement et vie de l'église au Moyen Âge*, 243–53. London: Variorum, 1979.
- . "The Synod of the Province of Rouen in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." In *Church and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to C. R. Cheney on His 70th Birthday*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke et al., trans. Geoffrey Martin, 19–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Foreville, Raymonde and Jean Leclercq. "Un débat sur le sacerdoce des moines au XII^e siècle." In *Analecta Monastica*. 4th ser. Rome: Libreria Vaticana, 1957.
- Fournier, Paul. *Les officialités au moyen âge: Étude sur l'organisation, la compétence et la procédure des tribunaux ecclésiastiques en France de 1180 à 1328*. Paris: Plon, 1880; reprint Aachen: Scientia Verlag, 1984.
- Frantzen, Allan. "When Women Aren't Enough." *Speculum* 68, 2 (1993): 445–71.

- Frassetto, Michael, ed. *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*. New York: Garland, 1998.
- Frauenknecht, Erwin. *Die Verteidigung der Priesterehe in der Reformzeit*. Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1997.
- Frazee, Charles A. "The Origins of Clerical Celibacy in the Western Church." *Church History* 57 (1988): 108–26.
- Funk, F. X. "Colibat und Priesterehe im Christlichen Altertum." *Kirchen Geschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen* 1 (1897): 121–55.
- Galbraith, V. H. "Notes on the Career of Samson, Bishop of Worcester (1096–1112)." *English Historical Review* 82 (1967): 86–98.
- Gaudemet, Jean. *Institutions Ecclésiastiques. Histoire des institutions françaises au Moyen Âge*, vol. 3. Ed. Ferdinand Lot and Robert Fawtier. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962.
- Gefou-Madianou, Dimitra, ed. *Alcohol, Gender and Culture*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Gibbs, Marion and Jane Lang. *Bishops and Reform, 1215–1272: With Special Reference to the Lateran Council of 1215*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Gilchrist, John. *Canon Law in the Age of Reform, Eleventh to the Twelfth Centuries*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1993.
- . *Church and Economic Activity in the Middle Ages*. London: St. Martin's, 1969.
- Gilmore, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Gleason, S. E. *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: The Bishopric of Bayeux, 1066–1204*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Goldberg, P. J. P. "Masters and Men in Later Medieval England." In Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 56–70.
- Gonthier, Dominique and Claire Le Bas. "Analyse socio-économique de quelques recueils de miracles dans la Normandie du XIe au XIIIe siècle." *Annales de Normandie* 24, 1 (1974): 3–36.
- Gouhier, Pierre and Ann Vallez. *Atlas historique de Normandie*. Caen: Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Quantitative, 1967.
- Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307*. London: Routledge, 1974.
- Grévy-Pons, Nicole. *Célibat et nature: Une controverse médiévale: à propos d'un traité du début du XVe siècle*. Paris: CNRS, 1975.

- Hadley, D. M., ed. *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*. London: Longman, 1999.
- Hallam, Elizabeth. *Capetian France, 987–1328*. New York: Longman, 1980.
- Hanawalt, Barbara. "The Host, the Law and the Ambiguous Space of Medieval London Taverns." In *Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England*, 104–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . "Men's Games, King's Deer: Poaching in Medieval England." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988): 175–93.
- Haskins, Charles Homer. *Norman Institutions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- . *The Normans in European History*. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1915.
- Helmholz, R. H. *Canon Law and the Law of England*. London: Hambledon, 1987.
- Hendrix, Scott. "Masculinity and Patriarchy in Reformation Germany." In Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 71–91.
- Hendrix, Scott and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, eds. *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*. Kirksville, Mo.: Truman State University Press, 2008.
- Herlihy, David. *Medieval Households*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Hollister, C. Warren. *The Making of England, from 55 B.C. to 1399*. Toronto: Heath, 1992.
- Jenkins, Claude. "A Thirteenth-Century Register: Odo, Archbishop of Rouen." *Church Quarterly Review* 101 (1925): 80–123.
- Johnson, Penelope. *Equal in Monastic Profession: Religious Women in Medieval France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Kaeuper, Richard. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Karant-Nunn, Susan C. "The Masculinity of Martin Luther: Theory, Practicality and Humor." In Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 167–189.
- Karras, Ruth Mazo. *Common Women: Prostitution and Sexuality in Medieval England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- . "Separating the Men from the Goats: Masculinity, Civilization and Identity Formation in the Medieval University." In *Conflicted Identities and*

- Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. Jacqueline Murray, 189–213. New York: Garland, 1999.
- . *Sexuality in Medieval Europe: Doing unto Others*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- . “Thomas Aquinas’s Chastity Belt: Clerical Masculinity in Medieval Europe.” In Lifshitz and Bitel, eds., *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*, 52–67.
- . *Unmarriages: Women, Men, and Sexual Unions in the Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Kay, Richard. *Council of Bourges, 1225: A Documentary History*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Kealey, Edward. *Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Kelleher, Marie. “‘Like Man and Wife’: Clerics’ Concubines in the Diocese of Barcelona.” *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 349–60.
- Kemp, Brian. “Hereditary Benefices in the Medieval English Church: A Herefordshire Example.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 43, 107 (1970): 1–15.
- Kieckhefer, Richard. *Magic in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Kimmel, Michael. “Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender.” In *The Masculinities Reader*, ed. Stephen M. Whitehead and Frank J. Barrett, 266–87. London: Polity, 2001.
- Kuefler, Mathew. “Male Friendship and the Suspicion of Sodomy in Twelfth-Century France.” In *Gender and Difference in the Middle Ages*, ed. Sharon Farmer and Carol Pasternack, 145–81. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- . *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Laeuchli, Samuel. *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972.
- Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Lea, Henry Charles. *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1907.
- Le clerc seculier au Moyen Âge: XXIIe Congrès de la S.H.M.E.S.* (Amiens, juin 1991). Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1993.

- Le Clercq, Jean. *Monks and Love in Twelfth Century France: Psycho-Historical Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Lees, Clare A., ed. *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Lenzen, Rolf. "Sodomitenschelte: Eine Invektive des Serlo von Bayeux?" In *Arbor amoena comis: 25 Jahre Mittellateinisches Seminar in Bonn 1965–1990*, ed. Ewald Konsgen, 189–92. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1990.
- Lepine, David. *A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages*. New York: Boydell, 1995.
- . "The Origins and Careers of the Canons of the Exeter Cathedral." In *Religious Beliefs and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England, 1300–1455*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, 87–120. New York: Boydell, 1991.
- Levin, Eve. *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs, 900–1700*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Leyser, Conrad. "Custom, Truth and Gender in Eleventh-Century Reform." *Studies in Church History* 34 (1998): 75–91.
- . "Masculinity in Flux: Nocturnal Emission and the Limits of Celibacy in the Early Middle Ages." In Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 103–20.
- Lifshitz, Felice and Lisa Bitel, eds. *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Little, Lester. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Livingston, Amy. *Out of Love for My Kin: Aristocratic Family Life in the Lands of the Loire, 1000–1200*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010.
- Longère, Jean. *Oeuvres oratoires de maîtres parisiens au XIII^e siècle: Étude historique et doctrinale*. 2 vols. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1975.
- Luchaire, Achille. *Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus*. Trans. Edward Krehbiel. New York: Ungar, 1957.
- Lynch, John E. "Marriage and the Celibacy of the Clergy: The Discipline of the Western Church: An Historico-Canonical Synopsis." *Jurist* 32 (1972): 14–38, 189–212.
- Lynch, Joseph. *The Medieval Church*. London: Longman, 1992.
- . *Simoniack Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976.
- Mabire, Jean. *Histoire de la Normandie*. Paris: France-Empire, 1986.
- Martin, A. Lynn. *Alcohol, Sex, and Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

- McLaughlin, Megan. "The Bishop in the Bedroom: Witnessing Episcopal Sexuality in the Age of Reform." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19, 1 (2010): 17–34.
- . "Secular and Spiritual Fatherhood in the Eleventh-Century." In *Conflicting Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. Jacqueline Murray, 25–44. New York: Garland, 1999.
- . *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000–1122*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- McLaughlin, T. P. "The Prohibition of Marriage Against Canons in the Early Twelfth Century." *Medieval Studies* 3 (1941): 94–100.
- McNamara, JoAnn. "The Herrenfrage: The Restructuring of the Gender System, 1050–1150." In Lees, ed., *Medieval Masculinities*, 3–29.
- Mehl, J.-M. "Les autorités ecclésiastiques face aux jeux sportifs dans la France médiévale." In *Sports und Kultur/Sport et civilisations*, ed. L. Burgener and M. Villett, 61–67. Berne: Publications Universitaires Européennes, 1986.
- . *Les jeux au royaume de France, du XIII^e au début du XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Fayard, 1990.
- . "Tricheurs et tricheries dans la France médiévale: L'exemple du jeu de des." *Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques* 8 (1981): 3–25.
- Meijns, Brigitte. "Opposition to Clerical Continence and the Gregorian Celibacy Legislation in the Diocese of Thèrouanne: *Tractatus pro clericorum conubio* (c.1077–1078)." *Sacris Erudiri* 47 (2008): 223–90.
- Ménard, Philippe. *Les Fabliaux: Contes à rire du moyen âge*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1983.
- Mentzer, Raymond A. "Masculinity and the Reformed Tradition in France." In Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 120–39.
- Miller, Andrew. "'To 'Frock' a Cleric: The Gendered Implications of Mutilating Ecclesiastical Vestments in Medieval England." *Gender & History* 24, 2 (August 2012): 271–91.
- Miller, Maureen C. "Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era." *Church History* 72, 1 (2003): 25–52.
- Mollat, G. "Le droit de patronage en Normandie du XI^e au XV^e siècle." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 33 (1937): 725–88.
- Moore, R. I. "Family, Community and Cult on the Eve of Gregorian Reform." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 30 (1980): 49–69.

- Moorman, John R. H. *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945.
- Morey, Adrian. "Canonist Evidence in the Case of St. William of York." *Cambridge Historical Journal* 10, 3 (1952): 352–53.
- Murray, Jacqueline. "Gendered Souls in Sexed Bodies: Male Construction of Sexuality in Some Medieval Confessors' Manuals." In *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Biller, 79–93. York: York Medieval Press, 1998.
- . "Hiding Behind the Universal Man: Male Sexuality in the Middle Ages." In Bullough and Brundage, eds., *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*, 123–53.
- . "'The law of sin that is my members': The Problem of Male Embodiment." In *Gender and Holiness: Men, Women, and Saints in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Samantha J. E. Riches and Sarah Salih, 9–22. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . "Masculinizing Religious Life: Sexual Prowess, the Battle for Chastity, and Monastic Identity." In *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. P. H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis, 24–42. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- . "One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?" In Lifshitz and Bitel, eds., *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe*, 34–51.
- Murray, Jacqueline and Konrad Eisenbichler, eds. *Desire and Discipline: Sex and Sexuality in the Premodern West*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Neal, Derek. *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Nicholl, Donald. *Thurstan: Archbishop of York, 1114–1140*. York: Stonegate, 1964.
- Newman, Charlotte. *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.
- O'Brien, Bruce. "R. W. Southern, John Boswell, and the Sexuality of Anselm." In *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, ed. Mathew Kuefler, 167–78. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Orme, Nicholas. *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066–1530*. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Parish, Helen. *Clerical Celibacy in the West, c.1100–1700*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010.

- . *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation: Precedent, Policy and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.
- . "It Was Never Good World Sence Ministers Must Have Wyves': Clerical Celibacy, Clerical Marriage, and Anticlericalism in Reformation England," *Journal of Religious History* 36, 1 (March 2012): 52–69.
- Parisse, Michel, ed. *Les Religieuses en France au XIIIe siècle*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1985.
- Partner, Nancy. "Henry of Huntingdon: Clerical Celibacy and the Writing of History," *Church History* 42, 4 (1973): 467–75.
- Peltzer, Jorg. *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c.1140–c.1230*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Plummer, Marjorie. *From Priest's Whore to Pastor's Wife: Clerical Marriage and the Process of Reform in the Early German Reformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012.
- Power, Daniel. "The Norman Church and the Angevin and Capetian Kings," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56, 2 (April 2005): 205–34.
- Puff, Helmut. *Sodomy in Reformation Germany and Switzerland, 1400–1600*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Roper, Lyndal. *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Religion and Sexuality in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Rossiaud, Jacques. *Medieval Prostitution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Rousseau, Constance. "Pope Innocent III and the Familial Relationships of the Clergy," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* n.s. 14 (1993): 105–48.
- Rousselle, Aline. *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity*. New York: Blackwell, 1988.
- Sawyer, Erin. "Celibate Pleasures: Masculinity, Desire and Asceticism in Augustine," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 6, 1 (1995): 1–29.
- Schimmelpfennig, Bernhard. "'Ex fornicatione nati': Studies on the Positions of Priests' Sons from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Century," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 2nd ser. 2 (1979): 3–50.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude. "The Ethics of Gesture." In *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, vol. 2, ed. Michael Feher, 128–47. New York: Zone, 1989.
- . *La raison des gestes dans l'Occident médiéval*. Paris: Gallimard, 1990.
- Schriber, Carolyn P. *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: New Ideas Versus Old Ideals*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

- Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *American Historical Review* 91, 5 (1986): 1053–75.
- Searle, Eleanor. *Predatory Kinship and the Creation of Norman Power, 840–1066*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Shahar, Shulamith. *Childhood in the Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Shinners, John and William J. Dohar, eds. *Pastors and the Care of Souls in Medieval England*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998.
- Skoda, Hannah. *Medieval Violence: Physical Brutality in Northern France, 1270–1330*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Smith, Katherine. *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*. New York: Boydell and Brewer, 2011.
- Southern, R. W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. New York: Penguin, 1970.
- Spear, David. *The Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals During the Ducal Period, 911–1204*. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. London: Institute of Historical Research, 2005.
- . "Power, Patronage, and Personality in the Norman Cathedral Chapters, 911–1204." In *Anglo-Norman Studies 20: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1997*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, 205–22. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998.
- . "The School of Caen Revisited." *Haskins Society Journal* 4 (1992): 55–66.
- . "William Bona Anima, Abbot of St. Stephen's of Caen, 1070–9." *Haskins Society Journal* 1 (1989): 51–60.
- Spierling, Karen E. "Father, Son, and Pious Christian: Conceptions of Masculinity in Reformation Geneva." In Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 95–119.
- Stafford, Pauline. "The Meanings of Hair in the Anglo-Norman World: Masculinity, Reform and National Identity." In *Saints, Scholars and Politicians: Gender as a Tool in Medieval Studies*, ed. Renée Nip and Mathilde Van Dijk, 153–71. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- Stone, Rachel. "Gender and Hierarchy: Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims (845–882) as a Religious Man." In Cullum and Lewis, eds., *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, 28–45.
- Strasser, Ulrike. "'The First Form and Grace': Ignatius of Loyola and the Reformation of Masculinity." In Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 45–70.

- Swanson, R. N. "Angels Incarnate: Clergy and Masculinity from Gregorian Reform to Reformation." In Hadley, ed., *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, 160–77.
- . *Church and Society in Late Medieval England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Tabbagh, Vincent. *Diocèse de Rouen. Fasti Ecclesiae Gallicanae 2*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996.
- Taglia, Kathryn Ann. "On account of scandal...: Priests, Their Children and the Ecclesiastical Demand for Celibacy." *Florilegium* 14 (1995–96): 57–70.
- Tellenbach, Gerd. *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- . *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Thibodeaux, Jennifer D. "The Defense of Clerical Marriage: Religious Identity and Masculinity in the Writings of Anglo-Norman Clerics." In Cullum and Lewis, eds., *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, 46–63.
- . "Family Networks and Ecclesiastical Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Normandy: A Reassessment." Paper presented at Texas Medieval Association Conference, University of Houston, October 2006.
- . "From Boys to Priests: Adolescence, Masculinity and the Parish Clergy in Medieval Normandy." In Thibodeaux, ed., *Negotiating Clerical Identities*, 136–58.
- . "Man of the Church or Man of the Village: Gender and the Parish Clergy in Medieval Normandy." *Gender and History* 18, 2 (2006): 380–99.
- . "Odo Rigaldus, the Norman Elite, and the Conflict over Masculine Prerogatives in the Diocese of Rouen." *Essays in Medieval Studies* 23 (2006): 41–55.
- , ed. *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010.
- . "Rethinking the Medieval Clergy and Masculinity." In Thibodeaux, ed., *Negotiating Clerical Identities*, 1–15.
- . "The Sexual Lives of Medieval Norman Clerics: A New Perspective on Clerical Sexuality." In *Sexuality in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times: New Approaches to a Fundamental Cultural-Historical and Literary-Anthropological Theme*, ed. Albrecht Classen, 471–83. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.

- Thièbaux, Marcelle. "The Medieval Chase." *Speculum* 42 (1967): 260–74.
- . *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- Thomas, Hugh. "Shame, Masculinity and the Death of Thomas Becket." *Speculum* 87, 4 (October 2012): 1050–88.
- Thomson, Willliell R. *Friars in the Cathedral: The First Franciscan Bishops, 1226–1261*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute, 1975.
- Thursty, B. Ann. *Bacchus and Civic Order: The Culture of Drink in Early Modern Germany*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Valantasis, Richard. "Constructions of Power in Asceticism." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63 (1995): 775–821.
- Van Eickels, Klaus. "Gendered Violence: Castration and Blinding as Punishment for Treason in Normandy and Anglo-Norman England." *Gender and History* 16, 3 (2004): 588–602.
- Van Houts, Elisabeth. "The Fate of Priests' Sons in Normandy with Special Reference to Serlo of Bayeux (d. after 1105/6)." *Haskins Society Journal* 25 (2013): 96–139.
- . "Latin Poetry and the Anglo-Norman Court, 1066–1135: The Carmen de Hastingae Proelio." *Journal of Medieval History* 15 (1989): 39–62.
- Vauchez, André. *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*. Trans. Jean Birrell. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Vaughn, Sally. *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State, 1034–1136*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981.
- Wiesner-Hanks, Merry. "Lustful Luther: Male Libido in the Writings of the Reformer." In Hendrix and Karant-Nunn, eds., *Masculinity in the Reformation Era*, 190–212.
- Wenzel, Siegfried. *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Werner, Janelle. "Promiscuous Priests and Vicarage Children: Clerical Sexuality and Masculinity in Late Medieval England." In Thibodeaux, ed., *Negotiating Clerical Identities*, 159–81.
- Wertheimer, Laura. "Children of Disorder: Clerical Parentage, Illegitimacy, and Reform in the Middle Ages." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 15, 3 (September 2006): 382–407.
- Wickham, Chris. "Gossip and Resistance Among the Medieval Peasantry." *Past and Present* 160 (1998): 3–24.

- Williams, George. *The Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Wood, Diana, ed. *The Church and Childhood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Yver, Jean. "Autour de l'absence d'avouerie en Normandie." *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie* 57 (1964): 251–70.
- Zeikowitz, Richard E. *Homoeroticism and Chivalry: Discourses of Male Same-Sex Desire in the Fourteenth Century*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.

Index



- abjurations *sub pena nubendi*, 156
- Adam of Yvecrique, priest, 143–44
- adultery: Christ born from, 107–8; disciplinary methods to prevent, 130; priestly unions not adultery, 91; result of forcible celibacy, 99; and sexual rivalries, 137–39
- Alexander II, pope, 48
- Alexander III, pope, 59, 61, 84
- Alexander IV, pope, 82
- Ambrose of Milan, 33
- d'Amiens, Thibaud, archbishop of Rouen, 116, 131, 187n18
- Anacletus, antipope, 31–32
- ancilla*, 46, 170n19
- Anger, father of Ouen and Thurstan, 57, 70, 173n31
- Anselm, abbot of Bec and archbishop of Canterbury, 4, 21, 42, 43, 46, 47; canons against sodomy, 100–101; concern over masculine appearance, 27, 30; on corruption of sacrament by impure priest, 39; Council of Westminster (1102), 51–53, 78; Council of Westminster (1108), 53–54; *Cur Deus Homo*, 90, 110; debate over his sexuality, 101, 179n 57; legislation against clerical sons, 78–79, 80; legislation inspired *Treatise on Grace*, 89, 93; legislation inspired writings of Norman Anonymous, 90, 93, 108; letters to Paschal II, 79–80; reform of clerical marriage, 50–54; use of maternal imagery, 18; use of virile imagery, 18–19, 22
- Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux: against antipope Anacletus, 32; and case of runaway priest, 62–63; on clerical sons and birth status, 83–84; critique of Gerald, bishop of Angoulême, 31–32; example of spiritual fatherhood, 67; and “G” de Lachun, 59–60; *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem Episcopum*, 31–32; nephew’s involvement in scandal, 61; patronage of nephews, 61, 67–68; and priest Hamon and his concubine, 60; and priest at Vasouy, 59, 63; reformer of concubinous clerics, 58–59, 61–62, 80, 83; refusal to support *nepotulis*, 84
- Arnulf of Rohes, 68
- Augustine of Hippo, 38, 92
- Autun, Council of, 89
- Barrow, Julia, 81
- Barstow, Anne, 11, 88, 177nn6, 7, 9, 12, 178n15

- Battle Abbey, monks of, 72
- Beaufour, Alan de, 72
- Beaufour, Richard, bishop of Avranches, 57, 72
- Bec, abbey of, 70, 78, 93
- Becket, Thomas, 67
- Belmeis family, 71–72
- benefices, 5–6, 9, 12, 33, 49, 53–54, 58, 59, 71, 72, 81, 82, 84, 104, 149, 155. *See also* hereditary benefices
- Bennett, Judith, 6
- Bernard of Clairvaux, 18, 70
- Bernard of Tiron, 19, 20, 39, 44
- Bloet, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, 51, 74, 79
- Bornstein, Daniel, 51
- Bourges, Council of, 7, 76, 77
- Bove family, 69, 74
- Brantham, church of, 72
- Brooke, C. N. L., 69, 80, 153, 162n21
- Brown, Peter, 2, 8
- Brundage, James, 98
- Bullough, Vern, 9
- Caen: hospitable environment for clerical sons, 107; St. Stephen's Abbey of, 48, 68, 90, 103, 104; town of, 68, 70, 103, 105
- Calixtus II, pope, 54, 175n61
- Calvinists, 159
- Cambrai, clergy of: 178n15; supporters of clerical marriage, 92, 96, 100; use of masculine language, 97
- canon law: barring marriages of clerical children, 76; new legal proceedings to discipline clergy, 113; restricting clerical marriage, 46–57; restricting sons of clergy, 12–13, 73, 75–81, 85; procedure *per inquisitionem*, 128, 131; procedure *per notorium*, 127–28, 131
- canonical purgation, 54, 128–30, 131, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 146, 147–49, 186n2
- canonries, 6, 72–73, 75, 85, 117
- Carthage, councils of, 4
- Cassiodorus, as original source for *Rescripta*, 88
- castration: in early Church, 33; for medical reasons, 34; in Normandy, 33–34; as political tool, 33–34; for sexual assault cases, 34; spiritual form of, 33, 36; symbolic meaning of, 34; writers against, 33, 34–35
- Cerisy-la-Forêt, officiality of, 151, 152, 154–57
- child oblates, 26
- Cicero, 114
- Cistercian maternal imagery, 18–19
- Clement, Odo, archbishop of Rouen, 116
- clergy. *See* priests
- clerical celibacy: for clerics in minor orders, 6, 48, 155; for clerics in major orders, 6, 32, 46, 87, 111, 138, 153; derived from Hebrew model of priesthood, 3; in early church councils, 3–4; granted only by grace of God, 93–95; in scriptures, 3–4; as sexualized chastity, 32–40. *See also* clerical marriage
- clerical concubines, 24, 30, 39, 41, 46–47, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 70, 92, 95, 96, 108, 112, 116, 118, 133, 140, 155, 187n18. *See also* clerical wives
- clerical continence: mandated by councils, 47; within marriage, 3–4, 47, 90–93
- clerical marriage: of clerics in minor orders, 6, 48, 155; continence within, 3–4, 47, 90–93; in early Normandy, 43–44; existence in England before Conquest, 44; Gerald of Wales on, 38, 39–40, 45, 58, 67, 169n118; as honorable institution, 90–98; impediment to Holy Orders, 89, 153; legislation against,

- 46–57; separation of priests and wives, 46, 47, 48, 54, 88, 153; tracts in favor of, 90–101
- clerical sons: educational opportunities for, 66–69; hereditary dynasties, 5, 12, 44, 54, 58, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81–82, 83, 85, 102, 103, 105, 106, 175n67, 181n78; illegitimacy of, 12, 76, 78, 102, 103, 153; legislation against, 75–80; marriages of, 76; ordination of, 12–13, 73, 75–77, 79, 80, 83, 85, 87, 90, 103, 104, 105, 107–8, 109–10; signs of sacerdotal impurity, 76, 83–84, 104, 106; tracts in favor of, 102–11
- clerical wives: despoiling church revenue, 30–31; enslavement of, 46, 47; legal status of, 95–96, 159, 171n59; punishment of, 46, 47, 52, 116; separation from husbands, 46, 47, 48, 54, 88, 153; as whores, 31, 42, 56, 57, 179n3. *See also* clerical concubines
- Clermont, Council of: canons on lay investiture, 170n25, 175n61; against clerical marriage, 47; against clerical sons, 77–78, 104; dissemination in Normandy, 78, 108, 175n62, 177n12, 180n68
- Cluny, abbey of, 70
- Colmieu, Pierre, archbishop of Rouen, 116
- concubina*, 41, 54, 96, 133
- Constitutions of Gallo, 131
- Coon, Lynda, 8
- Corinthians: as defense of clerical celibacy, 3, 92, 124; as defense of priestly marriage, 95
- Crispin, Gilbert, 23, 44
- Crosby, Everett, 5
- cullagium*, 53–54, 56–57
- Cullum, Patricia, 9, 66, 138, 155
- Damian, Peter, 42, 47
- Davis, Adam, 118, 162n20
- diffamatus*, definition of, 127, 186n2
- diffamationes* (letters of defamation), 129, 162n20
- Douglas, Mary, 7–8
- drunkenness: associated with violence, 145, 149; canon law against, 8, 115, 116, 142; of clergy, 23, 129, 130, 141–42, 145, 149, 152, 193n89; Protestant reformers on, 159; sermons against, 123–24
- Druval, Nicolas de, 82
- Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, 53, 73; depiction of clerical wives, 54; use of virile language in 20, 27
- effeminacy: at court, 28–29; Gerald of Wales on, 31; and masculine self-governance, 29; of monks, 98, 101, 104; of priests and secular clerics, 8, 30, 132; as reason for sinking of White Ship, 29; as result of domination by women, 27–30, 98, 132; Serlo of Sées and, 27–28; similar to sodomy, 28–29, 30, 98, 101; Wulfstan of Worcester and, 28
- Elliott, Dyan, 8
- Elvira, Council of, 3–4
- “emascularity,” 9
- Ephesians, 21
- d’Étampes, Thibaud: 70; association with Caen, 68, 107; dispute with Rosceline of Compiègne, 106, 107; as priest’s son, 68, 107; support of priests’ sons, 107–8; tract against ordination of monks, 106; writings of, 106, 108, 109
- Eucharist: 39, 44, 50, 56, 121; sacramental purity of, 4; sexual abstinence of priest in relation to, 3–4, 40
- eunuchism, 33, 34. *See also* castration

- Fenton, Kristen, 17, 178n37
- focaria*, 114, 133
- Flambard, Ranulph, bishop of Durham, 69, 70, 72
- Fliche, Augustin, 88, 177n14
- Frassetto, Michael, 11
- Frauenknecht, Erwin, 88, 177nn6, 12, 15
- Fulk of Guernanville: the younger, 24; the elder, 24, 71
- gambling: canon law against, 8, 116, 117, 125; among Norman clergy, 141, 142–43, 145
- Ganymede, 101
- Geoffrey of Anjou, 34
- Geoffrey, archbishop of Rouen, 55
- Gerald, bishop of Angoulême, 31–32
- Gerald of Wales: battle against carnal desire, 35–36, 37–39, 40; critique of priests and their sexual behavior, 1, 45, 67; critique of Reginald Foliot's androgyny, 31; periodic abstinence to preserve purity of sacrament by unchaste priest, 39–40; struggle to become bishop, 58; use of virile language, 19–20
- Gerard, archbishop of York, 21, 39, 52, 71, 83
- Gerard, bishop-elect of Sées, 34
- Gilbert of Evreux, 77–78
- Gregory VII, pope, 7, 46, 48, 78, 88
- Gregory IX, pope, 118
- Gregorian Reform, 17, 78
- Grosseteste, Robert, 114
- Grossus, Geoffrey, 39
- Guitmond, 64, 73
- Gundulf of Rochester, 43
- Henry I, king of England (r.1100–1135), 28, 46, 53, 77
- Henry II, king of England (r.1154–89), 68, 172n77
- Henry of Huntingdon, 29, 56, 57, 74
- Herbert of Losinga, bishop of Norwich, 19, 24, 43, 51–52, 101
- hereditary benefices, 5–6, 12, 54, 58, 65, 66, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 80, 82–83, 106, 175n66, 181n78
- Hereford, diocese of, 10, 42, 58, 81
- Herfast, bishop of Thetford, 49
- Herluin, vita of, 23
- Hildebert, bishop of LeMans, 36
- Holy Orders: marriage as impediment to, 87, 153; requirements for ordination to, 66, 157, 191n57. *See also* ordination
- Honorius III, pope, 116, 131
- Hugh the Chanter, 21
- Hugh of Lincoln, 40
- Hugh of Lisieux, 43
- Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry: nephew of Arnulf of Lisieux, 61, 67, 84; as father of Philip, 84–85
- Hugh of St. Victor, 115
- "identity politics," 2
- Ignatius of Loyola, 160
- infamia*, definition of, 127, 135, 186n2
- Innocent III, pope, 127–28, 186n2
- Innocent IV, pope, 116
- Ivo of Sées, 43
- Jacob and Esau, as representations, 23
- Jesus Christ: 3, 33, 39, 104, 120, 124; born from adultery, 107–8; as bridegroom of Church, 91, 124; as "mother" in Cistercian devotion, 18, 21
- Jocelyn, bishop of Salisbury, 83

- John d'Avranches (John of Avranches),
 archbishop of Rouen, 43, 72; correspondence with Lanfranc, 49; hardline approach toward clerical marriage, 42, 47, 48–49, 55, 77–78, 89; stoned out of synod, 41
- John of Civières, 148–49
- John of Crema, 54, 56, 158
- John of Forde, 10
- John, bishop of Lisieux, 67, 84
- Karlstadt, Andreas, 158
- Karras, Ruth, 75, 157, 164n3
- Lanfranc, abbot of St. Stephen's and
 archbishop of Canterbury, 4, 5, 20, 42, 47, 48–50, 51, 53, 68, 73, 78, 89, 103
- language of virility: contrasted with language of effeminacy, 18; derived from Roman concepts, 16–17; scholars' misapplication of terms to describe religious men, 17; used by medieval Christian writers to describe clergy, 17–21; used in primacy debate between York and Canterbury, 21
- Lateran I, 70, 87, 89, 153
- Lateran II, 77, 89, 112, 114
- Lateran III, 114
- Lateran IV, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 113, 115–17, 119, 142, 156
- Leo IX, pope, 46
- Leofwine of Lichfield, bishop, 48
- Leviticus, book of, 123
- Leyser, Conrad, 8
- Lille, Alain de, *Summa de arte praedicatoria*, 115
- Lillebonne, Council of, 50, 77
- Lisieux, councils of: (1055), 46, 77; (1064), 41, 47–48, 77, 95; (1448), 81
- Lucius III, pope, 127
- Luther, Martin, 158–59
- Lyon, Council of, 117
- Maccabees, book of, 122
- male body: appearance and comportment of, 7, 8, 13, 27–29, 31, 114–16, 121, 152, 154; fully intact genitalia of, 34–35, 43; impenetrability of, 16, 26; impurity of, 7–8, 39, 40, 63, 76, 83, 104, 115, 119, 122–23, 137; laxity as sign of effeminacy, 27–29, 31; purity of, 24–25, 122
- marriage. *See* clerical marriage
- martial imagery, 15, 19, 22–23, 33, 34, 36–38, 123–24
- Matilda of Ramsbury, 46
- Maurice, archbishop of Rouen, 116
- Maurice, bishop of London, 35, 43, 71, 72, 79
- Maurilius, archbishop of Rouen, 48, 77, 78
- Melancthon, Philip, 158
- Melfi, Council of, 47, 77, 166n63
- Miller, Maureen, 17, 164n4
- minor clerics: career mobility, 6–7, 154–56; marriages, 6–7, 48, 49, 156–57; problems with status, 9, 154–56, 157
- monks: correcting lay masculinity, 27–28; creation of manly celibate ideal, 16–40; and fight against sexual desire, 23, 32–40; ordination of, 106–7; as reformers of clergy, 2, 7–8, 10, 12–13, 26, 56, 64–65, 71, 101, 158; as sodomites, 12, 100–101, 104–6; as soldiers of Christ, 22–23, 37–39; as virile men, 16–26
- Murray, Jacqueline, 8, 35, 163n31
- Neal, Derek, 9
- nepotism: *nepos* as euphemism for “son,”

- 82–83, 84; cathedral chapters associated with, 68–70, 71–72. *See also* hereditary benefices
- “new man” concept: employed by clerics who defended marriage, 107, 109, 119; from Ephesians, 21; employed by monastic writers, 21–26, 123–25
- “new men,” as royal servants, 43, 45
- Nicea, Council of, 4, 33
- Nicholas II, pope, 46, 88
- “Nicolaitans,” 46
- Norman Anonymus: use of Anselmian concepts, 90, 93–94, 110; *Apologia pro filiis sacerdotum et concubinarum* (J22/26), 89, 92, 96, 108; on clerical marriage, 91–92, 93, 94, 96; identity of, 78, 89–90; on ordination of clerical sons, 108–10; *Scire velim quis primus instituit* (J25), 89, 91, 93, 96, 99, 110
- “normannization” of clergy, 4
- Noyon, cathedral clerics, 96–97, 107–8, 178n15
- Odelarius, father of Orderic Vitalis, 15, 64
- ordination: 39, 52, 118; of clerical sons, 12–13, 75–80, 85, 87, 90, 103, 105–6, 107–8, 109–10; delay of ordination to priesthood, 138, 155; earliest ages at, 66; marriage after, 4, 73, 83; marriage before, 83; of minor clerics, 155, 157, 191n57; of monks, 30
- Orme, Nicholas, 66
- d’Orvial, Hugh, 34
- Osbert of Bayeux, nephew of Thurstan and Ouen, 70
- Osbert, father of bishops Samson and Thomas, 73
- Ouen, bishop of Evreux, 57, 70–71
- Paris, Council of, 131–32
- Paris, University of, 123
- Parish, Helen, 158
- Partner, Nancy, 56
- Paschal II, pope: on impurity of sacraments from concubinous priests, 39, 52; on use of priests’ sons as ministers, 79–80, 81–82
- “pastoral revolution,” 7–8, 13, 111, 112, 114–15, 125, 152
- Pavia, Council of, 7
- pedissecas*, 133
- Philippe Augustus, king of France (1180–1223), 113
- Poitiers, Council of, 47, 76–77, 89
- Pont de l’Arche, William, bishop of Lisieux, 117–18
- poulaines*, 28, 29, 167n76
- Premonstratensians, 154
- priests: in adulterous unions, 130, 137–39; bonding with laymen, 126, 141–43, 145; and concubinage, 20, 40, 59–62, 79, 83, 92, 95, 106, 107, 116, 132–37, 139, 152; defense of traditional masculinity, 90–101; and drunkenness, 23, 129, 130, 141–42, 145, 149, 152; and fornication, 23, 30–31, 37, 39–40, 79, 91–93, 116–17, 121–24, 133–34, 140; and gambling, 141, 142–43, 145; involvement with multiple women, 139, 140; marriage of, 41–63, 90–101; physical appearance of, 7–8, 11, 13, 27–31, 40, 114–16, 121, 152; physical prowess, 126, 145–46; training of, 66–69; and violent behavior, 146–47
- prostitution, 25, 27, 86, 99, 140, 158
- Protestantism: new standards of masculinity, 158–60; repercussions for clerical marriage, 158–60

- Puff, Helmut, 158
- purity: as defense of celibacy, 3, 33, 115, 124–25; within marriage, 3, 91–92; of sacraments, 1–3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 3
- Radbod, bishop of Sées, 68
- Reformation, 158–60. *See also* Calvin; Luther; Zwingli
- Rescripta*, 177nn7, 9; attributed to Ulric of Imola and Ulric of Augsburg, 88; contribution to Reformation pro-marriage tracts, 158
- Rheims, councils of: (1049), 44; (1119), 54–55, 106–7, 175n61; riot of clergy at, 55
- Rigaldus, Odo, archbishop of Rouen: on appearance and comportment of clergy, 121, 123; use of canonical purgation, 129–30, 131, 134–35; on chastity of priests, 120–21, 122–23, 124–25; councils and synods held by, 117–18; use of fines to discipline clergy, 130; use of letters of defamation, 129–30, 187n9; the “new man,” 123–25; pollution of sacraments by impure priests, 121–22, 123; his *Register*, 114, 117, 127, 129; sermons on clerical manliness, 118–25; on sobriety of priests, 122, 123; visitations of Normandy, 117–18, 149
- Robert of Courson, 115
- Robert of Poulain, 116
- Roger, bishop of Coutances, 57, 71
- Roger of Salisbury, 45–46, 51, 57, 79
- Rollo, 24, 44
- Rosceline of Compiègne, 106–7
- Rotrou, archbishop of Rouen, 62–63, 172n77
- Rouen, councils of: (1055), 77; (1064), 48; (1072), 77–78, 89; (1096), 77, 90, 108, 175n62, 177n12; (1128), 56; (1190), 114; (1214), 115, 132, 188n19; (1224), 116; (1231), 81, 117; (1445), 81
- Rufus, William, 27, 28, 29
- Saane, Guillaume de, 82
- Samson, bishop of Worcester: 42, 70, 73; as father, 73, 79, 174n51; married bishop, 51, 73, 79
- Samuel, first book of, 123
- Samuel, second book of, 121, 123
- Schimmelpfenning, Bernhard, 76
- Searle, Eleanor, 65
- secular canons, 24, 44, 47, 52, 61, 69
- Sées, cathedral chapter of, 34, 117, 162n16
- Seneca, 114
- Serlo of Bayeux: as author of *Nos uxorati*, 86, 100, 176n1, 177n2; *Defensio pro presbyterorum*, 92, 104, 177n2; deprived of inheritance, 103–4; *Invectio in Gillebertum abbatem*, 104; patronage by bishop Odo of Bayeux, 105; as priest’s son, 103; *Quae monachi quaerunt*, 103–4; against sodomites, 86, 100, 104
- sexualized chastity, 2, 11, 32–40, 41, 63, 112, 151, 154
- Sigillo, Robert de, 72
- Silverius, 105
- Smith, Katherine, 22, 37
- sodomy: legislation against, 100–101; monastic reformers labeled sodomites, 86, 89, 98–100, 104; as a problem at court, 28–30; as problem within monasteries, 101; as result of forcible celibacy, 93, 94, 99; similar to effeminacy, 28–29, 30
- somatic control, 2, 8, 115, 145. *See also* male body
- Sorenc, Roger de, 138–39, 191n60

- soule*, 146, 194n107
- Spear, David, 68
- Strasser, Ulrike, 160
- taverns (and tavern-frequenting): 6, 8, 13, 141–43, 144, 145, 150; legislation against, 115, 117
- Tellenbach, Gerd, 7, 163n24
- Thomas I, archbishop of York, 42, 70, 73
- Thomas II, archbishop of York, 21, 30, 35, 70, 73
- Thurstan, archbishop of York, 20, 57, 69, 70–71, 106, 173n31
- Tractatus pro clericorum conubio*: 88, 99–100; disputed origins of, 88–89, 177nn9, 12, 15; ideas in favor of clerical marriage, 90–92, 95–96; ideas in favor of clerical sons, 105–6, 109
- Treatise on Grace*: 88; author of, 89, 177n12; commonalities with Norman Anonymous, 90, 93, 94; ideas in favor of clerical marriage, 95, 98–99; use of grace, 93–94
- Trent, Council of, 160
- Ulric of Augsburg, 88
- Ulric of Imola, 88, 177n7
- Urban II, pope, 47, 77, 79, 108
- Urban III, pope, 81
- violence: 115, 144, 145, 149, 152; among clergy, 137, 141, 144–45; in taverns, 142, 144–45
- Vitalis, Orderic: 10, 15, 41, 64; on effeminacy and sodomy, 28–29; and language of virility in *Ecclesiastical History*, 17, 22, 28, 164n1, 9; on married priests, 44; “new man,” 22–23, 26; priests and sexual behavior, 25
- Von Bora, Katharina, 158
- Von Eickels, Klaus, 34
- Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, 20
- Walter of Aronville, 134–36
- Walter of Coutances, archbishop of Rouen, 134–36
- Walter, Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, 31
- Werner, Janelle, 9–10
- Westminster, councils of: (1102), 27, 56, 78–79, 83, 100; (1108), 53, 54, 56, 80; (1125), 80; (1138), 80; canons condemning clerical marriage, 39, 51–53, 54, 56, 80; canons condemning sodomy, 100–101; prompted writing of tracts by Norman Anonymous, 89–90
- William Bona Anima, archbishop of Rouen: 58, 77, 103; author known as Norman Anonymous, 78, 89–90, 175n62; issues with election to see of Rouen, 64, 73, 78; son of a bishop, 64, 68, 73, 77, 78, 90
- William of Malmesbury: 10, 25–26, 27, 28, 73; *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, 34–35; *Historia Novella*, 30; condemnation of sodomy and effeminacy, 29, 30, 53, 101
- William the Conqueror, 34, 50, 53
- Williams, George, 78, 175n62
- Winchester, Council of, 47–50, 53, 89
- Wulfstan of Worcester, 28, 73
- Zwingli, 159

Acknowledgments



I would like to thank the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Department of History, the College of Arts and Sciences, Provost Beverly Kopper, and Chancellor Richard Telfer for the support of a one-year sabbatical leave, which enabled me to complete a substantial portion of this manuscript. Full-year sabbaticals are increasingly precious and few for academics, but so crucial for conducting long-term research projects. Also, I am grateful to Provost Kopper for the funds she provided to the History Department for faculty research assistants. Shawna Maasz proofread chapters, compiled my bibliography, checked for typos and other mistakes, and compiled an incredible database of my records. All remaining errors are my own. The Anderson Library staff at UW-W never questioned the large number of books I checked out, and they handled my numerous interlibrary loan and universal-borrowing requests with finesse. I am sincerely grateful for the incredible resources of the UW System Libraries.

I would like to express my gratitude to Ruth Mazo Karras. Ruth Karras saw potential in my early work when others did not. I am most grateful for her support of my research and this project in particular. Her own scholarship has greatly influenced my work in gender history, and inspired me toward new and exciting ways to read medieval sources. Her students are profoundly fortunate to have her as a mentor. I must also thank Hugh Thomas, who provided an excellent critique of the manuscript. His critical feedback helped me gain perspective on some of my major themes and allowed me to improve the argument significantly. He was very generous and prompt with his feedback, and he went above and beyond to assist a junior scholar. We should have more academics like him. I would also like to thank the two anonymous readers of the manuscript for taking their valuable time to respond with timely criticism. Jerry

Singerman was very prompt in taking my manuscript through the publication process and providing helpful advice.

I would like to acknowledge Patricia Cullum and Katherine Lewis for my invitation to present a plenary lecture at the “Religious Men in the Middle Ages” conference at the University of Huddersfield (UK). The paper I presented was a smaller version of Chapter 4; material from this chapter was published in the volume *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, edited by Patricia Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis. I would also like to thank Boydell and Brewer press, and its editor Caroline Palmer, for permission to use the material from the essay.

I would also like to thank Elisabeth van Houts for providing her unpublished work to me. I have benefited so much from her recent research on Serlo of Bayeux, and Chapter 4 would not have been the same without it. Professor van Houts was very generous in reviewing a draft of Chapter 4, and I gained much from her astute commentary. I also thank John S. Ott for allowing me to cite his excellent translations of the “Letters of the Cambrai and Noyon clergy.”

I will forever owe a debt to Professor Eve Levin for her ongoing guidance and willingness to support my work, and for the support of the late Zoltan Kozstolnyik. Professor Irving Kelter and his wife, the late Janice Gordon-Kelter, have offered enormous support and encouragement to me over the course of my career.

Various medieval colleagues provided assistance in some form along the way to the publication of this book. I am overwhelmed by their generosity: Kit French, Valerie Garver, Marie Kelleher, Tanya Stabler Miller, David Perry, Mike Ryan, and Janelle Werner all gave me advice and shared their materials with me.

My mother, Karen Thibodeaux, always thought I could do anything; I know this book will make her glow with pride. My husband, Ben Shult, has lived with this project longer than anyone else. He has been encouraging and helpful in a variety of ways, from reading the book proposal to taking our children out of the house so I could work. I have promised him that he will get the next book’s dedication. My daughter Lucy will undoubtedly continue to wonder why I am obsessed with medieval priests. My son Owen was conceived about the same time as this project and born shortly before my sabbatical began. My sabbatical leave was defined by the book and the baby, periods of intellectual activity interspersed with mothering. I held him in my arms while reading articles and books, and I wrote early in the morning while he slept. It seems only fitting that now, as he enters pre-Kindergarten, this book be dedicated to him.